

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, FEBRUARY 1, 1862.

WE understand it was expected that a case would have been heard upon oral evidence under the new system before the Master of the Rolls on Wednesday last. For some reason, however, the hearing did not come off; but it being stated that two days would probably be occupied in the oral examination of witnesses, it suggests the probability of the present number of the judges of the Court of Chancery being unable to get through its business if the new system is adopted by litigants to any considerable extent. Notwithstanding the many admitted advantages of oral examination, it has, no doubt, some drawbacks, not the least of which is the terrible facility which it affords for the consumption of judicial time.

THE Irish solicitors are now making a move to obtain the election of at least one or two members of their body as Benchers of the King's Inns, Dublin. This ancient and honourable society is not constituted upon exactly the same principles as Lincoln's Inn and the other great Inns of Court in London. Its objects and functions are not identified exclusively with the Bar. No one can be called to the Irish Bar without being a member of the King's Inns; but solicitors also are members, and have the privilege of using the dining hall and library, of which they avail themselves largely. The Bench or Council of the Society, however, has long been a very exclusive body—much more so indeed than any of the English Inns of Court. In any of the latter are to be found almost as matter of course all the Queen's counsel belonging to the respective Societies. But in Dublin it rarely happens that any member of the King's Inns attains its Bench without first taking his seat on the Bench of the Four Courts, or at least holding high office under the Crown. As there is only one Inn of Court in Ireland, and as there are nearly a hundred Queen's counsel, it would no doubt be undesirable that every barrister who attains the dignity of a silk gown should *ex officio* become one of the governing body of the King's Inns; nor is there any reason why it should be constituted solely either of judicial or of professional dignitaries. The whole society being composed of members of both branches of the profession, both ought to be, to some extent at least, represented in its Council. The society, we believe, is only a voluntary association, analogous to the English Inns of Court, and as it derives a large share not only of its influence but of its funds from the solicitors, it cannot be considered that the movement now in progress is unreasonable or offensive. We hope, therefore, that it will obtain the general countenance and support of the profession in Ireland.

THE Equity Courts rose yesterday upon the conclusion of Term. They will sit again on Friday, the 7th instant.

NOTICE has been given that on the next meeting of Middlesex magistrates it will be moved, under the provisions of an Act of Parliament, that a petition be prepared to her Majesty in council for dividing the office of coroner of Middlesex into three districts—the western to be divided into two and the eastern to remain as it is—one. It will not affect the coronerships for the Duchy of Lancaster and Westminster; and as, in the event of the proposed alteration being carried into effect, each district will have to elect its own coroner, instead of the whole county being called upon to elect, great expense will be avoided in canvassing and otherwise when an election may take place.

THE Rev. Hugh Weightman, M.A., of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, late curate of St. George's, Hanover-square, is practising at the common law bar. He graduated in 1840, and having been called to the bar, entered upon practice in London and on the Oxford circuit. His views inclining him to a religious life his thoughts were directed to the ministry of the Established Church; and in 1845 he received ordination at the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Another change has overtaken him, and being discontented with the terms, he has, like Mr. M'Naught, of Liverpool, and Mr. Cornish, of Exeter, abandoned the ministry. He has resumed practice as a Barrister, and has appeared in wig and gown in Westminster Hall.

ELSEWHERE in our columns will be found an account of the Bills in Parliament for the formation of new lines of railway in England and Wales, in which the standing orders have been complied with. We note all these from week to week, and also other Parliamentary intelligence relating to public companies, as well as the result of the half-yearly meetings of such as are of sufficient importance. We always make it a point of giving the dividends of all the principal railway companies; and on the whole, we think this department of the Journal will be found to be very useful for the purpose of reference.

THE great number and expense of statutory notices in Bankruptcy, and also in the administration of estates, suggest the advisableness of adopting some tabular or other easy form which would have the effect of cutting down the length and saving expense, by avoiding the repetition of merely formal matter.

THE following gentlemen were called to the bar on the 27th instant:—

Lincoln's-inn: Henry Ludlow, Esq., Charles Carleton Massey, Esq., John Ignatius Williams, Esq., Arthur Pemberton Lonsdale, Esq., James Dearden, Esq., Sackville Davis, Esq., James Clayfield Clayfield Ireland, Esq., William Holding, Esq., William Fletcher Atkinson, Esq., Francis Cowley Bernard, Esq., Henry Thomas Salmon, Esq., Robert Harrop, Esq., Joseph Hobbs, Esq., John Edwin Hilary Skinner, Esq., Douglas Parry Crooke, Esq., Edward Thomas Smith, Esq., William Fox Haves, Esq., Thomas Calthorpe Blofeld, Esq., William Barber, Esq., and Thomas Berwick, Esq.
Inner Temple: Thomas Minchin Goodeve, Esq., Arthur Charles, Esq., George Philippo, Esq., Clement Francis Cornwall, Esq., David John Vavasor Durell, Esq., William Alexander Dumaresq, Esq., Percival Henry Wormald, Esq., Marston Clarke Buzsard, Esq., William Cecil Pardoe Purton, Esq., Charles Owen, Esq., John Lloyd Wharton, Esq., William Graham, Esq., Arundel Rogers, Esq., Charles Mathew Clode, Esq., Henry William Edge, Esq., William Ralston Shedden Ralston, Esq., and Mark John Stewart, Esq.

Middle Temple: James Thomson Jeffery, Esq., Samuel Francis Hewitt, Esq., Thomas Walker, Esq., Joseph Underhill, Esq., and Richard Edward Cumberland, Esq.

Gray's-inn: Thomas Green, Esq., Hugh Cowie, Esq., and Thomas Newton, Esq.

The number of candidates who attended the examination of articulated clerks at the Incorporated Law Society was 88. The examiners were Sir A. D. Croft, Mr. Ford, Mr. Ouvry, Mr. Janson, and Mr. Coverdale.

MR. J. W. DEAN, of 23, Bloomsbury-square, has been appointed a London commissioner to administer oaths in chancery.

MR. JONATHAN BOUCHIER has been appointed a clerk of the second class in the office of examiners of criminal law accounts.

MR. A. KINLOCH FORBES, acting secretary to the Bombay Government in the political, judicial, and edu-

national departments, has been appointed acting judge of the Sudder Adawlut, in the room of Mr. R. Kenys, who has proceeded to this country on sick leave.

MR. PHILIP ERNEST LEMAN has been appointed a junior clerk in the Crown Office.

EARL RUSSELL'S ANSWER TO MR. SEWARD'S LEGAL ARGUMENT.

In another part of our impression to-day appears in full the promised official chapter of international law in answer to the legal argument, the substance of which may be found in our number of the 18th of this month. Lord Russell has, doubtless, written under the advice of the eminent Crown civil lawyer, and so far as the terms of the legal propositions reasoned in the paper extend, it is, at least, satisfactory. But whether, having regard to the unprecedented circumstances of fact which underlie those terms, Lord Russell's answer closes the controversy, may well be doubted. If it had that effect, one might feel disposed to pass over the anomaly of a Minister of the Crown, however experienced, indulging in a speculative disquisition on neutral rights to be read to the foreign secretary of another country. For, practically, since the captives taken from under the British flag have been unconditionally restored, there exists no controversy. It would appear to us, who are not professional statesmen, that the more prudent and less impulsive course might have been to accept the restoration as an answer to the despatch of November 30th, which being written to Lord Lyons, required redress in the shape of "the liberation of the four gentlemen, and their delivery to your lordship, in order that they may be placed under British protection, and a suitable apology for the aggression which has been committed." The Queen's Government, according to the despatch of the 11th of January, declared that they arrived at the conclusion that the liberation of the prisoners and Mr. Seward's explanations constituted the reparation which her Majesty and the British nation had a right to expect. And Lord Russell stated that it was not necessary he should there discuss Mr. Seward's five points, but that it was necessary he should say that the Government differed from Mr. Seward in some of the conclusions at which he had arrived. Might not England, with dignity and safety, have stopped there? Is it wise in a nation any more than in an individual, when the matter in dispute has been adjusted, to call out to a retiring adversary, "Ah, but you were wrong, and I'm right; and I can prove it."

The object of the present paper, as described by its author, is, that it may lead to a better understanding on points of international law which may in future arise between England and America. But to attempt a demonstration that an antagonist, who has submitted, was in the wrong in his argument, does not generally lead to the best understanding in the time to come.

Such considerations, perhaps, belong rather to politicians; yet, as we have said, there are circumstances really underlying the reasoning of Lord Russell, which make it impossible for us to treat it as mere legal argument. Thus, it may be perfectly true, as decided in the case of the *Caroline*, cited by him, that "the neutral country has a right to preserve its relations with the enemy, and you are not at liberty to conclude that any communication between them can partake, in any degree, of the nature of hostility against you." But what application ought this principle and the subsequent remarks of Sir William Scott, in his judgment, to have or not to have to a case where in fact, at the time when the question of contraband arises, the neutral state has no relations at all with the enemy, and where the enemy's independence, which the establishment of such relations would practically favour, is the very pith and marrow of the belligerent strife. Lord Russell argues,

that it is the neutrality of the one party to the communication, and not either the mode of the communication or the time when it first takes place, which furnishes the test of the true application of the principle. But neutrality may seem inconsistent with a case where communication itself is regarded by the other belligerent as of the nature of a hostile act.

The key to Mr. Seward's argument is, we think, to be found in the following passage of his despatch to Mr. Adams, Nov. 30th. He writes:—"You spoke the simple fact when you told him (Lord Palmerston) that the life of the insurrection is sustained by its hopes of recognition in Great Britain and France. It would perish in ninety days if those hopes should cease. I have never for a moment believed that such a recognition would take place without producing immediately a war between the United States and all the recognising Powers." Now the footing upon which, Lord Russell admits, Messrs. Mason and Slidell would have been, if at all, received, is described in the present despatch thus: that they would have been clothed with the powers, and have enjoyed the immunities, of ministers. This footing, Lord Russell contends, could not have been justly regarded, according to the law of nations, as a hostile or unfriendly act towards the United States. In such a state of practical conflict between two powerful nations, it is in vain to attempt to exhaust argument from law books for the purpose of moving Mr. Seward from his position, that the carriage by a neutral of men clothing themselves, and to be clothed by the neutral government, with the character of ministers of a confederacy, of which the recognition would produce an immediate war with the neutral, is a carriage of contraband. Let us not be misunderstood as endeavouring to reply to Lord Russell. Our object is to show that, while the legal argument of Mr. Seward was probably intended to be an elaborate excuse to his own countrymen for giving up the prisoners, and an equally elaborate reflection on the former practice by England of belligerent rights or powers, Lord Russell's forensic answer, now gratuitously put forth, however it may hold water as a mere legal structure, is not at all conclusive on the substantial matter of the dispute.

Indeed, in some respects, Lord Russell has taken an uphill ground. Mr. Seward thought fit, apparently in a style neither serious nor respectful, to dispose of the cardinal question of a neutral ship between neutral ports thus, in six lines:—

"I assume, in the present case, what, as I read in the British authorities, is regarded by Great Britain herself as true maritime law, that the circumstance that the *Trent* was proceeding from a neutral port to another neutral port does not modify the rights of the belligerent power."

Mr. Seward does not condescend to tell Lord Russell where in British authorities he finds this law, but leaves the matter at large on the Admiralty reports. Whereupon, the case being really over, and, for aught we know, the next case having been called on, the noble Foreign Secretary treats this off-hand argument, which we really thought a sarcasm, gravely and anxiously, reminding the public of a studious junior who has caught deferentially some general allusion in the argument of the Queen's counsel on the other side, and who, when he reaches his chambers, proceeds to work out an opinion without knowing distinctly to what the allusion referred. A minister, instead of allowing himself to be "drawn out," might more fitly have answered, that until Mr. Seward pointed out the British authorities referred to, his assumption must be passed over as unsupported.

Our view of the true character of this controversy is much strengthened by Lord Russell's conclusion, that "the Government would not acquiesce in the capture of any British merchant ship in circumstances similar

to those of the *Trent*; and that the fact of its being brought before a prize court, though it would alter the character, would not diminish the gravity, of the offence against the law of nations which would thereby be committed." Surely if admiralty judgments are the authorities for trying whether the *Trent* passengers were contraband or not, a prize court could hardly be an improper arena to decide the very question. For a long time the chief ground of complaint was, that Captain Wilkes did not take the steamer into a prize court. Mr. Seward went so far as to regard himself as Britain's benefactor on this point. The forbearance of Captain Wilkes to tow away the *Trent* and her mails to New York was "a gift" and "a charity;" and Mr. Seward magnanimously held, "it is of the very nature of a gift or charity that the giver cannot, after the exercise of his benevolence is past, recall or modify its benefits." And consequently that he could not then turn round and ask the British Government to allow Captain Wilkes to repair his omission, and invite the *Trent* to come voluntarily into an American prize court. And now Lord Russell, that "it may lead to a better understanding," contentiously rejects Mr. Seward's boon. This is an explosive kind of oil to pour on subsiding waters.

The embrangement of imaginary swords to promote the good understanding does not end here. Mr. Seward, with a hypothetical flourish to "Bunkum," had said, "If the safety of this Union required the detention of the captured persons it would be the right and duty of this Government to detain them;" but that in consideration of the declining state of the rebellion and the insignificance of the captured persons, he did not resort to that defence. This "frankness" compels Lord Russell to be "equally open," and to inform Mr. Seward that Great Britain could not have submitted to the perpetration of that wrong, however flourishing might have been the insurrection and however important the persons. Such is the present phase of this Anglo-American paper war. It has arrived at the point of hypothetical threat and defiance usually reached when, after the cause of quarrel is removed, either party attempts to prove that he is in the right, and to gain credit for prowess with the spectators. If Mr. Seward takes the same view of his controversial duties as Lord Russell there may be an American reply, to be met in the spring by a British rejoinder, and so on through the seasons. For, according to the latest conception of official obligations, a diplomatic pen cannot becomingly be laid down until it has had the last word.

THE PROPER BOUNDS OF ENQUIRY IN LUNACY.

The lunacy inquiry whose name is nausea, has for the greater part of four-and-thirty days so dinned the public ear with its self-told tale of the abuse of justice, that our duty of general reprobation has been forestalled. We have to-day no task of detection. Hole and corner abuses may have a respite for a while. We are not called upon to rouse the public to remedy a wrong. *Facit indignatio*—indignation has been stirring up leading articles in every man's own breast. Thirty-four days! more than the ninth part of a working year of the valuable lives of a Master, 6 counsel, and 22 special jurymen, with 160 witnesses called before them, or whatever other number may correctly express this branch of the arithmetic of the inquiry, whether William Frederick Windham "is a lunatic, or enjoys lucid intervals, so that he is not sufficient for the government of himself, his manors, messuages, lands, tenements, goods, and chattels, and if so, from what time, after what manner, and how." In such a state of things it would be fastidious and hypercritical to question whether the evidence of this or that particular witness was properly admitted, as, for instance, a witness called to prove a collateral issue

of the credibility of another witness; or whether, again, evidence was receivable of what some other witness told the testifying witness that one of the petitioners had said to that other witness. One might imagine that, under the fiction of this being a Crown inquiry for the alleged lunatic's benefit, the proceedings were conducted on some prerogative or paternal rather than any judicial system. Yet, in truth, in such proceedings on the subject of insanity the same general rules of evidence ought to be observed as on other trials. It is not, however, to be concluded that any departure from the technical rules of evidence contributed materially to protract this inquiry thus to the ninth part of a year. The vice lay in the entire system of the petitioners' mode of conducting their case. We do not mean that their counsel committed an error. On the contrary, the counsel took what seems to have been the only course that gave their clients a chance of a verdict—namely, to prove the existence of such a congenital incapacity in the "poor idiot," were it called imbecility, or "amentia," or what not, as would inevitably prevent his ever being "sufficient for the government of himself, his manors, &c." It was only upon this theory that driving engines, playing a footman's part, marrying a Rotten-row adventuress, and alleged indecent exposures and personal uncleanness, which in themselves are certainly none of them proofs of unsoundness of mind, could be tainted with mental incapacity. If the congenital defect were established, all these acts might plausibly be represented as courses into which "the half-idiot" had been helplessly drifted, so that he was not able to keep his ground in the common affairs of life. Nor, again, under these circumstances, and in the absence of any well-defined limits to the mode of prosecuting a lunacy commission, can we lay blame on the Master that he did not shorten the inquiry, nor can we make him responsible for this episode in his judicial life. He could not have interfered to check the flow of the petitioners' evidence without damming up their whole case. That flow having once been permitted, of course the other side must be allowed a corresponding freedom.

Nevertheless, if the system of lunacy inquiry be not materially changed by placing some bounds to congenital theories and their consequent practice, it is plain that every commission may amplify itself into a biographical inquisition. Pointings and kickings in the nursery will open the evidence; then will come the tricks played on the page, to be followed by school antics, coupled, may be, with a glaring false quantity or concord in the fourth form, to be wound up by a passion for Bohemia, or the prize ring, or the rail, all carried out with an utter recklessness of money. The old rule, that particular acts of madness are to be given in evidence, and not general evidence that the person is insane, will not suffice to restrict the inquiry within proper bounds, for such is the subtle learning of certain experts, that upon a short notice, they can arrange a theory of madness to fit and systematise any given facts, remote or present, special or general, which diverge never so little from the beaten path of conventional life.

What, then, is to be done that the administration of lunacy justice may be spared a repetition of the scandal which came to an end on Thursday from sheer exhaustion under its own dead weight? Ordinarily, reliance is placed upon the judge to restrain, within reasonable compass, the proceeding over which he presides. There have certainly been ten or twelve day trials at law, especially when life has been at stake; and hearings of a fortnight in equity, when some complicated and momentous fraud has been in process of dissection, are within memory. But we have no recollection of anything hitherto approaching a rate of nine cases in a twelve-month. The control of the judge is, in most cases, effectual. In Lunacy two difficulties stand in the way. The first is incidental to the character of the inquiry,

and, we have already seen, was glaringly exemplified in the Windham case. The other difficulty is practically no less noxious. The Master, generally a man promoted to the office from a mediocre practice at the Bar, and the only person concerned who is disinterested as to protraction, sits with an array against him of half a dozen benefited counsel, of whom the leaders are men of the highest rank and greatest experience in the profession of advocates, and are also, it is almost superfluous to add, in the receipt of large daily fees, dependent on the length of time for which their services may be rendered. To these add three-and-twenty gentlemen, who being mostly put into the box for the sake of the daily fee, through personal good-will, innocent withal, in official quarters, are stimulated to a mock attention to all that every witness details, be it during thirty or any other number of sittings. The cautious Master therefore must maintain a diffident dignity. It is not in the nature of his position that he should hold the reins with a tight hand. Then, in answer to the question what is to be done, we might obviously propose that heavy Lunacy commissions be directed to one of the judges of the superior courts of law or equity. The objection would be that the pressure of their own business might prevent such a course. In the country, particularly, the services of such a judge could not be secured without great inconvenience to his court.

Failing the resource of a superior judge to preside when the property at stake is large, and the inquiry of too great amplification, some rule of practice should, if possible, be devised to direct and enable the Master to put such an efficient control on the proceedings as the decent exigencies of Justice demand. No ordinary Court Rules could be framed that would be applicable to cases generally. But if attention be given to the shape of the commission itself, or rather in the first place to the shape of the affidavits on which it ought to be issued, some good may perhaps be attainable. At present the depositions of doctors are principally relied on in making out a *prima facie* case for a commission. Such depositions are, we venture to think, next to worthless on the plain question, whether a man is capable of managing himself and his affairs. That is a question which addresses itself eminently to men conversant with the ordinary affairs of life in their intercourse one with another. It would appear, therefore, to us that the affidavits should make out a case of facts within the personal knowledge of the deponent, which in themselves are proof of insanity. We do not mean constructive proof, such as the facts of driving a railway engine or eating a whole nest of eggs, but facts which, as compared with the realities of life, are inconsistent with anything but mental delusion. It is perfectly clear that if a man is incapable from unsoundness or defect of mind, he must have given evidence of the fact by some act of commission or omission within a definite period, a few weeks or months even of the time of the application. The very necessity of going back for remoter facts weakens the proof of his present insanity. We should, therefore, propose that distinct and recent facts be laid in the affidavits as the proofs to be exclusively relied on and evidenced in the inquiry. Such a mode would impose upon the authority issuing the commission a wholesome and practicable responsibility. He would in effect sanction the issues of fact charged as constituting the lunacy. The commission might be directed to inquire into the truth of these facts. Upon such inquiry the jury would give their verdict of soundness or unsoundness of mind. Thus, indeed, in its essential features the control of a superior judge would be obtained. To carry out some such plan powers might be given by statute to the Lord Chancellor in the coming session. The subject, at least, can hardly escape the early attention of Parliament.

The Courts.

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH.

(Sittings in Banco, before Lord Chief Justice COCKBURN, and Justices WIGHTMAN, CROMPTON, and MELLOR.)

Jan. 28.—*Chawin v. Alexander*.—In this case Mr. Griffiths had obtained a rule, calling upon the plaintiff to show cause why the defendant should not be discharged out of custody, he having been wrongfully arrested under a writ of *ca. sa.* The defendant had become insolvent, and had obtained his protection. At his last appearance at an adjourned meeting in the Insolvent Court his further hearing was adjourned *sine die*, without protection. On leaving the court he was arrested and taken to prison.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE said the Court were all clearly of opinion that an insolvent stood in the same position with regard to arrest as any other person in a suit in which he was interested. Whatever might have been the practice at chambers, the point had never been presented to the full Court before now, and the Court entertained no doubt on the general principle. Independent of any protection under the Insolvent Act, a person going to and from the Court under a process of the court was protected from arrest.

The other learned judges concurred.

Rule absolute.

Jan. 31.—*Reg. v. Roberts*.—This was a rule calling upon Mr. William Prowling Roberts, of Manchester, to show cause why a criminal information should not issue for libel.

The *Attorney-General* and Mr. Monk for the prosecution; Mr. Sergeant Wheeler and Mr. Baglis showed cause.

It appeared the defendant had been an attorney for thirty years. The libel complained of was a letter written by the defendant to the prosecutor, Mr. Samuel Pope, a barrister of the Northern Circuit, in consequence of observations made by him in the course of the trial of an action for seduction, before Mr. Justice Crompton, at the last Liverpool assizes. It was contended the present case was altogether unprecedented. It was not alleged to be an attack upon a public officer or magistrate. The nearest case was that of a libel upon Mr. Austin, the well-known Parliamentary counsel, by Mr. Disraeli, for statements made by the former before an election committee of the House of Commons.

COCKBURN, C.J., said he remembered the case, and had been junior counsel to Mr. Austin before the election committee, and had afterwards made affidavit on his behalf, upon which the rule in *Reg. v. Disraeli* was granted.

Counsel read the letter in that case from a pamphlet published at the time by Mr. Stammers, the barrister, procured from the Gray's Inn library. There, however, the libel was addressed to a third person, here to the party complaining himself. *Ex parte Chapman*, 4 A. & E.; *Reg. v. Weguelin*, 2 Stark, N. P.; "Starkie on Libel," p. 280. This was merely an indignant comment upon what Mr. Pope had uttered beyond his duty; besides, it was denied that Mr. Roberts had published it, "except to three or four friends who had heard of the matter, and were desirous of having it explained." Their interest in the matter was such as to make the showing privileged within *Harrison v. Bush*, 5 E. & B. 344.

COCKBURN, C.J.—The question is, whether your client has merely explained his conduct, or gone on further to libel Mr. Pope.

It is submitted what he did must be taken on his affidavit to be merely such an explanation as was privileged. And then the sending it to Mr. Pope, as it is not a provocation to a breach of peace, or is not suggested by his affidavit to be so, is no ground for a criminal information. Then there is a suggestion that Roberts being an attorney of considerable practice at the assizes, had for its object the deterring of the prosecutor, and any barrister to whom it might be shown, from the fearless performance of his duty as counsel. Another point is, that Mr. Roberts swears that he believes Mr. Pope has himself extensively circulated or exhibited this letter.

CROMPTON, J. said it was fair he should say he saw nothing improper in what Mr. Pope said at the trial, neither did he see anything wrong in the conduct of the attorney. He certainly had thought all through the trial that it was a case for one farthing damages. Yet Mr. Pope had knowledge of antecedent circumstances, not known to the Judge, which ought to have protected the attorney from such an attack.

COCKBURN, C.J.—But those were not in proof at the trial. As I understand it, while the case was proceeding the Judge interposed and made a suggestion, in which the plaintiff's

counsel would not concur, then Mr. Pope made the remarks referred to.

That was so, but Mr. Roberts swears that before the trial £75 were offered.

COCKBURN, C.J.—Yes, for damages and costs. That would leave little for damages?

The affidavit states further that when the judge interposed and a juror also expressed an unfavourable opinion, that the plaintiff's counsel pressed on Mr. Robert's clerk the settlement which had been offered. That the clerk informed the plaintiff's friends of that advice, but they still persisted in requiring the trial to proceed. The expressions complained of as used by Mr. Pope were, that the action was brought for costs and not for the benefit of the plaintiff.

COCKBURN, C.J.—The position of the counsel must be looked at. That referred to, viz., the consultation by the clerk of the plaintiff's friends was very material to exonerate Mr. Roberts as an attorney, but it must be shown to be known to Mr. Pope.

The Attorney-General.—It is not stated in the affidavits to have been known to him.

COCKBURN, C.J.—Even on Mr. Roberts showing, he should have written a temperate letter. It is in coarse, abusive, ungentleman-like language. It ought to be withdrawn, and any imputation made by Mr. Pope through inadvertence would be withdrawn. The matter ought to be so settled. A gentleman in Mr. Roberts position should not have put himself in the wrong by writing such a letter.

CROMPTON, J.—The language is unjustifiable.

WIGHTMAN, J.—It is no doubt coarse and abusive. It ought be settled.

The Attorney-General said he regretted to say Mr. Pope was absent, and he had no authority himself to settle it. He was prepared to contend that Mr. Pope had not transcended the fair privilege of his profession, and was justified in what he said by the circumstances.

COCKBURN, C.J.—The attorney was smarting under what appeared to him a great injustice done him. Some account must be taken of his feelings. If he now expresses his regret and withdraws the expressions he may ask in return a withdrawal of any imputation upon his character as attorney.

The Attorney-General said his task was lightened by the assurance of the Court's opinion that Mr. Pope had not exceeded his duty.

WIGHTMAN, J.—Certainly.

The Attorney-General.—That being so, and Mr. Roberts having, by his affidavit, relieved himself of any suspicion of impropriety in the bringing the action, I, for Mr. Pope, will say that Mr. Roberts having explained his conduct, that I withdraw all imputations that Mr. Pope may have made upon him.

Mr. Serjeant Wheeler only desired to negative on behalf of his client that he intended to influence any member of the bar. He, therefore, for his client, withdrew the expressions complained of.

COCKBURN, C.J.—And expresses regret at having used language which he now feels to be unjustifiable and improper.

Serjeant Wheeler.—Quite so, my lord.

Jan. 30.—*In re Richard Sill*.—Mr. Gray moved to make a rule absolute that had been granted in this case, calling upon Mr. Richard Sill, an attorney of Birmingham, to show cause why he should not be struck off the rolls of the court for professional misconduct.

Master Unthank having read his report.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE said this no doubt was a very serious case. Mr. Sill had received from his client the sum of £500, to be paid into court under a judge's order. In consequence of an appeal against that order, the money was not wanted to be immediately paid into court, but it was the attorney's bounded duty, if he kept the money instead of returning it to his client, to have deposited it where it would have been perfectly safe until it had been decided whether it should be paid into court or returned to the client. Instead of that, Mr. Sill had paid it into his banker's to an over-drawn account, had spent it, and when called upon to account for it, he fabricated a series of falsehoods for the purpose of defeating and delaying the client whose money he had thus disposed of. Such conduct in an officer of the court was not only reprehensible; but that it showed him unfit to be an officer of the court, to whom clients had to entrust large sums of money in the discharge of his duty towards them, was abundantly clear. Probably, if this had been the first instance of misconduct against Mr. Sill, the Court might have looked to see if there was any honesty of inten-

tion on his part in the first instance, and although, even in that case, it would have been the duty of the Court to have dealt severely with him, they would not have felt themselves called upon to proceed to the extremity they must now necessarily adopt. It had been brought to the knowledge of the Court in the course of the present proceedings that Mr. Sill had on a former occasion been removed from the rolls of the court for professional misconduct, though afterwards restored, in the full belief that the warning he had received would have operated so as to have prevented his falling again into professional misconduct. Unhappily, that warning had not had the salutary effect desired, and, this being his second act of professional delinquency, and one of a heinous character, the Court could do no other than order that Mr. Sill should be struck off the rolls of the court.

Judgment accordingly.

BAIL COURT.

(Sittings in Banco, before Mr. Justice BLACKBURN.)

CRIMINAL INFORMATION.

Jan. 28.—*The Queen v. Bell*.—Mr. Gray applied, on behalf of Messrs. Whitehead & Harper, attorneys in Lancashire, and clerks to the magistrates, calling upon the defendant to show cause why a criminal information should not be filed against him for libel. It appeared that in consequence of the non-return by Mr. Bell of a list of persons qualified for constables for the township of Heaton, of which he was one of the overseers, the justices directed the applicants to proceed against the inhabitants in the Queen's Bench, to compel them to make that return. That was done, and a bill of costs incurred. Application was made to Bell and others for payment, but they refused, and a rule was obtained and made absolute against them for the amount. The costs amounted to £73 14s. 1d. After some correspondence between the parties Mr. Harper agreed to take £50. It was not accepted, and a writ of *fi. fa.* was issued, the amount having increased to £112. Mr. Bell afterwards published a placard in reference to these proceedings, in which he spoke of the applicants "as two needy muck-worms," "two greedy lawyers, who had for years sucked the township, and were again attempting to satisfy their appetites out of the inhabitants." Mr. Harper, who was an ensign of volunteers, was designated in the placard as "Lieutenant Blubber."

Mr. Justice BLACKBURN said it was one of those attacks that carried its own antidote with it, and one that would not make any person of common sense think worse of the applicants. It was a very abusive, absurd, and dirty libel. The learned counsel might take a rule.

Rule granted.

Jan. 30.—*Levy v. Lewis*.—In this case a rule had been obtained calling upon the defendant to show cause why he should not pay a certain sum of money, pursuant to an award.

Mr. Keane showed cause against the rule for the defendant. It appeared that the action was referred to two arbitrators, and the learned counsel contended that as the arbitrators had not signed the award in the presence of each other, as they ought to have done, such a signing would not do.

Mr. Haddleston, Q. C., admitted that he could not get over the technical objection raised by the defendant. He suggested that the award should be remitted back to the arbitrators.

Some discussion took place between the learned judge and the learned counsel, and ultimately Mr. Haddleston's suggestion was adopted, and it was arranged that the award should be remitted back to the same arbitrators, but the rule must be discharged.

Rule discharged accordingly.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

(Before Mr. Commissioner HOLROYD.)

Jan. 24.—*In re P. Hayward*.—This debtor formerly practised as a solicitor, but for some years past he has been an inmate of the Queen's Bench Prison. He was adjudicated bankrupt on the occasion of the recent gaol delivery, and he now disputed the adjudication.

Mr. Aldridge appeared in support of the adjudication; the bankrupt conducted his own case.

The bankrupt said that he had been arrested upon a judgment obtained in respect of a debt under £20, and that consequently his detention was illegal. The registrar had no power to adjudicate.

The COMMISSIONER said that there were other detainers against the bankrupt.

The bankrupt said that was so, but, inasmuch as the original arrest was unlawful, the subsequent detainers were void.

The COMMISSIONER said he could not interfere. The bankruptcy must proceed.

(Before Mr. Commissioner GOULBURN.)

Jan. 27.—*Re Young*.—An attempt had been made to obtain an adjudication of bankruptcy in the matter of Henry Wells Young, a solicitor, formerly of Gray's Inn-square (who has recently been convicted of forging powers of attorney, whereby stock was drawn out of the Bank of England). The trading was alleged to be that of a money scrivener, and one or two cases were put in evidence in which Young had charged for obtaining advances of money for clients; but

His Honour did not consider the evidence sufficient to support an adjudication. Young's object seemed to be to get the money of persons in his power, rightly if he could, but somehow at all events.

Adjudication annulled.

Re Lyons.—The bankrupt, George Joseph Lyons, was described as of Great Mistenden, Bucks, out of business.

At a former sitting the Court was asked to confirm a resolution of the creditors, agreeing to take a composition of 2s. 6d. in the pound, and to take the case out of bankruptcy.

His Honour now gave the judgment. He said that the parties framing the resolution had very much misconstrued the Act of Parliament. They had sought to make a resolution under the 110th section fit the provisions of the 185th section. The Court could not confirm the resolution, but was anxious that the real sense of the creditors should be taken at a meeting called by ten days' notice, and the Court would then be disposed to give full effect to their resolution. His Honour dwelt upon the fact that at a previous meeting all the creditors had voted by proxy; a Mr. Minns having held slips of paper from them, and he seemed to be like a perfect automaton, working the wires beautifully.

The examination of the bankrupt was adjourned until the result of the arrangement should be known.

Mr. C. E. Lewis, Mr. Lawrence, and Mr. Linklater appeared in the case.

(Before Mr. Commissioner EVANS.)

Jan. 29.—*In re Curtis*.—The bankrupt was a rag-outer at Berkhamstead. He applied some few days since for an order of discharge.

The COMMISSIONER now gave judgment. This was an application for an order of discharge under the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 134. It was objected on the part of a creditor that the bankrupt had given an undue preference to his mother. For the bankrupt it was contended that although by the 12 & 13 Vict. c. 106, & 256, such conduct was a ground for suspending the certificate, yet that under the 159th section of the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 134, the bankrupt had committed no offence whatever. It appeared that the 256th section of the old Act was repealed, and that the 159th section of the new Act contained no mention of undue preference. In this state of things he felt bound to grant an immediate order of discharge.

Mr. Bagley appeared for the assignees; Mr. Doris and Mr. Lawrence for creditors; and Mr. Treherne for the bankrupt.

CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT.

(Before Mr. Baron CHANNELL.)

Jan. 29.—Henry Wells Young, a solicitor, pleaded guilty to two indictments charging him with feloniously forging two warrants of attorney for the transfer of £5,000 stock, with intent to defraud the Governor and Company of the Bank of England.

Mr. Metcalfe, on behalf of the prisoner, said that he had unhappily expended the money in speculation, and had hoped to be able to replace it.

Mr. Baron CHANNELL, addressing the prisoner, said, from the position he had held he must know that but a few years since the crime to which he had pleaded guilty was very often visited by capital punishment. The law now took a more merciful view of such cases, but still the crime of forgery, and such forgery as the prisoner had been guilty of, must be put down by severe punishment. He considered the circumstances under which the forgery had been committed were very aggra-

vated. The prisoner had abused the confidence of his client, and, painful as it was to him, he felt that he would not be doing his duty if he were not to pass such a heavy sentence as he was about to pass. He then sentenced the prisoner to be kept in penal servitude for 20 years.

Recent Decisions.

EQUITY.

PURCHASE OF REVERSIONARY INTEREST.

Perfect v. Lane, L.J., 10 W. R. 197.

Cases in which the sale of a reversionary estate is impeached are considered by courts of equity as constituting a special class, depending, to some extent, upon peculiar principles. Equity, however, has always been cautious in attempting to give any definition of this class, or of laying down any inflexible rules in reference to it. It is obvious that there are (almost of necessity) in every such case several elements favourable to speculative litigation. As a general rule, and especially in the case of heirs, reversions are sold under a pressure of circumstances, and, not unfrequently, the purchasers are those who have the power of applying the pressure. Very often, moreover, the falling in of the reversionary interest is expectant upon the happening of some event, the time of the occurrence of which must be uncertain. If it should happen, therefore, that a reversion falls in at an unexpectedly early period, the question may arise whether the price paid by the purchaser was adequate or not; and according to the decision of Sir John Romilly, M.R., in *Salter v. Bradshaw*, 26 Beav. 161, the purchaser will have the burden of establishing that he has paid a full price. In order to maintain the validity of such a transaction, he must "preserve abundant evidence" that the reversion was not worth more than what he gave for it. This case, however, seems to carry the doctrine of the Court further than some of the older authorities, which required that fraud or imposition on the part of the purchaser either should be expressly proved or else that it might be implied from the inadequacy of the consideration, or from other circumstances attending the transaction. The rule, however, as enunciated by Sir J. Romilly, M.R., is not without countenance from some of the older cases, and has the express sanction of many recent ones, including the above-named case of *Perfect v. Lane*. But whatever doubt there may be as to the side on which the burden of proof lies, there can be none that a court of equity will set aside a purchase of a reversionary interest where there does appear to be fraud; and it is to be remembered that the insufficiency of price may of itself be held to amount to fraud in the eye of the Court. The adequacy of the price, however, is, of course, to be estimated with reference to the time of the contract, not of the event; and it has been laid down in more than one authority that the fair value of a reversion in no way depends upon the event, but is simply what the reversion might be expected to have fetched if sold in the market.

In *Perfect v. Lane*, Lord Justice Turner, after observing that "purchasers of reversionary interests are bound to prove that they have given the fair value," says that in cases of estimable value, this would "in general be the market value." This case also modifies somewhat the rule which requires purchasers to have given a fair price—namely, that where the purchaser calculates the value upon particulars furnished by the vendor, it is not competent to the vendor to allege afterwards that the particulars were incorrect.

COMMON LAW.

PRACTICE—AMENDMENTS OF PARTIES—EJECTMENT.

Blake v. Done, Exch., 10 W. R. 175.

Here the question arose whether, under the Common Law Procedure Act, 1852, a judge at nisi prius has power to amend a writ of ejectment by adding thereto, as plaintiffs, fresh parties. At the close of the plaintiff's case it appeared that the legal estate in the premises never vested in A. (under whom the plaintiff claimed), but in B. and C., who were trustees for A., and had not been made parties to the record. On this the judge amended the writ by adding thereto the names of B. and C.—they appearing in court and consenting to be joined as co-plaintiffs. It was then contended by the defendant that this addition caused a *misjoinder*; inasmuch as A. had no legal estate which qualified him to sustain an action of ejectment; but this objection was overruled, and the plaintiffs had a verdict.

It was now urged on the Court in banc, on a motion to enter a nonsuit in the place of a verdict for the plaintiffs, that there were only three clauses in the Act (15 & 16 Viet. c. 76)—viz., ss. 34, 35, and 222—under which an amendment of the parties could possibly be made; and that *Robson v. Doyle* (3 Ell. & Bl. 396) had already decided that such an amendment could not be made under the section last named, but must be made (if at all) under the 34th and 35th; and that these had no reference to the action of ejectment, which was regulated by a set of appropriate clauses peculiar to itself. The Court, however, held that the words of the 222nd section, as they empowered, and, indeed, required, the judge to make all such amendments as may be necessary for the purpose of determining in the existing suit the real question in controversy between the parties, were sufficiently large to embrace even an amendment such as the one under consideration; and this though it had the effect of substituting one plaintiff in the place of another. For the real question in the present case was, whether A., B., and C., or any of them, had the legal estate in the premises claimed, and consequently the amendment did not alter the question to be tried, but enabled it to be tried, which was the object of the Act.

It may be remarked that in *Sawyer v. Olley* (1 Pos. & Fin. 637), a writ of ejectment was, in like manner, amended by adding the names of certain parties who were co-devisees of the original plaintiff, as it appeared that their title was identical, and that the defendant could not be prejudiced. And, further, that by the Common Law Procedure Act, 1860 (23 & 24 Viet. c. 126), s. 19, the joinder of too many plaintiffs is now not fatal, but "every" action may be brought in the name of all the persons in whom the legal right may be supposed to exist, and judgment given in favour of such one or more of them as shall be adjudged by the Court entitled to recover. If this provision applies to ejectment as well as other actions (and there seems no reason to think otherwise), then the objection of misjoinder after the amendment of the writ was manifestly groundless.

ADMISSIBILITY OF VERBAL EVIDENCE TO EXPLAIN A WRITTEN CONTRACT.

Wallis v. Littlell, C. P., 10 W. R. 192.

There are few rules more important or of more general application than that which forbids the reception of any evidence by word of mouth, to contradict or vary a valid agreement which has been reduced by the parties to writing. This rule, which (as observed by Mr. Taylor, p. 893) may be traced back to a remote antiquity, is founded on the obvious inconvenience of allowing that which was finally intended to embody the agreement in question, to be controlled by the uncertain testimony of memory. Yet, in applying the rule, it is sometimes necessary to advert to nice distinctions. For example, it is no infringement of it to show by oral testimony that the agreement was not a valid one (as having been obtained by fraud and the like), or that it has been discharged; or to give verbal proof of an independent collateral fact explanatory of the instrument, or even in contradiction of the recital of some formal matter therein, as of its date. And such evidence, moreover, may be well adduced in order to enable the Court to discover the meaning of the instrument, where it is otherwise unintelligible or is susceptible of more meanings than one, a doctrine which is the foundation of the admissibility of evidence as to usage—that is to say, of witnesses conversant with the business, trade, or locality to which the document relates; who are allowed to give verbal testimony that according to the recognised practice and usage of such business, trade, or locality, certain expressions contained in the writing have, in similar documents, a particular conventional meaning. So also it is admissible where adduced to prove a fact material to the due ascertainment of the subject-matter of the writing.

To turn now more particularly to the present case, it is confirmatory of a reading of the fundamental rule above given which was established in two recent cases—one in the Common Pleas, the other in the Queen's Bench. For in *Davis v. Jones* (17 C. B. 625), it was held to be no infringement of the rule to admit verbal testimony to show that an undated written contract was intended to operate not from its delivery, but from the time when something not mentioned therein was done by the party seeking to enforce the contract. And in *Pym v. Campbell* (29 L. J. Q. B. 277), the same proposition was laid down in very similar terms. So also in the present case, where an action was brought on an agreement whereby the defendant contracted to assign certain premises to the plaintiff, and it was pleaded (*inter alia*), that at the time of

making such agreement it was agreed between the plaintiff and defendant that the agreement to assign should be void if the landlord of the defendant should not within a reasonable time consent to the assignment—it was held that such plea might be proved by witnesses who swore to its being verbally agreed between the parties as mentioned therein, when the written agreement was signed. The Court said that such a contemporaneous oral agreement operated in analogy to the delivering of a deed as an "escrow," and suspended the commencement of the written obligation without in any way varying or contradicting its terms.

Correspondence.

THE "LAW TIMES" AND ITS PROPRIETOR.

YOUR correspondent, F. C. P.,* is right. You can afford to treat with contempt the repetition of statements which you have certainly proved to be false. You have shown indisputably that the untrue statement in the notorious circular issued to the profession by the proprietor of the *Law Times*, was put forth with a distinct knowledge of its untruth, and while he himself was acting in a manner which puts his knowledge beyond all doubt. I see that he says (last week) in reference to the proceedings before Mr. Commissioner Goulburn, that "the shareholder was not the only mover in the matter." This I believe, although he says it. There can be no doubt that Mr. E. W. Cox is the real mover, and that the shareholder who holds two out of 600 shares is only an obliging agent in the matter.

But Mr. E. W. Cox is now only acting as proprietor of the *Law Times*, in the same way as he has conducted himself as a proprietor of the *The Field*; *The Clerical Journal*; *The Critic*; *The Sportsman's Calendar*, and divers other publications too numerous to mention; if the profession wants any information on this subject, it is to be had in abundance in various articles in magazines and other periodicals devoted to Mr. Cox and his doings, to which I can refer you. This gentleman, who affects to be the guide and counsellor of the legal profession, assumes as much for the very different communities of the sporting and the religious world. I am not certain that, considering the disgraceful manner in which he has acted towards the *Solicitor's Journal* and the legal profession, you ought not once for all to show him up; but you adopt at all events, a more dignified, if not a wiser course.

Z.

VOLUNTARY ASSIGNMENTS OF CHATTELS-REAL—27 ELIZ. C. 4.

In answer to your correspondent "Subscriber," I would call his attention to *Woodie's Case*, cited in *Colville v. Parker*, Cro. Jac. 158, in which leaseholds are held to be within the scope of the above statute.

As to the question whether an indemnity given by the assignee to the lessee against non-payment of rent and breach of covenants would be held to take an assignment (otherwise voluntary), out of the operation of the statute, I can find no cases directly in point; but as it is an acknowledged principle that merely undertaking to do what the law would of itself enforce is no consideration at all, there can be little doubt that the fact of the assignee entering into covenants for the payment of the rent and the performance of the covenants in the lease only, will make no difference:—for the assignee is liable to indemnify the lessee who assigns to him against breaches during the time he (the assignee) is in possession, although he has not covenanted so to do. (See Sugden's *Vend. & Pur.*, 13th edit., p. 30.)

It would seem, then, that an assignee should extend his indemnity further than this in order to raise a consideration.

B. A. L.

This statute does not indeed apply to mere personality (*Jones v. Croucher*, 1 Sim. & St. 315). Its words, "lands, tenements, or other hereditaments whatsoever," clearly include chattels real; and leaseholds formed the subject of the voluntary conveyance questioned under the statute in *Richards v. Lewis*, 11 C. B. 1035. That the conveyance may be within the exception contained in sect. 4, it must be made, not only *bona fide*, but also for a valuable consideration, and though inadequacy of consideration alone will not conclusively de-

tablish *mala fides*, yet, in the case put (*ante*, p. 214), it appears that no valuable consideration whatever is intended, unless the agreement on the part of the assignee to pay the rent reserved by the lease be considered to be such; and this, it may fairly be argued, is but an ordinary incident of such an assignment. I. S.

In reply to the question in the *Solicitors' Journal* of 25th of January, 1862, p. 214, it is clear that 27 Eliz. c. 4 extends to chattels-real; Co. Litt. 3 b; 6 Rep. 72—*ergo*, the covenants entered into by the assignee cannot uphold the deed of gift. H. P.

EJECTMENT.

The Common Law Procedure Act, 1852, sect. 168, enacts that the writ shall be "directed to the persons in possession by name." It would not, therefore, be correct to insert the name of an imaginary defendant.

In the case mentioned by your correspondent, C.W.W.* the writ should, I think, be directed to the lessee, or person last in possession, and served in the manner pointed out by the 170th section of that Act. G. B. W.

DEVISE OF REAL ESTATE.

Having regard to the replies given by T. D. and C. W. W. on this subject in your journal of 27th of July last, I shall be glad to learn from one of them, through your columns, if, supposing the will under which S. H. took was made in 1806, any difference will occur in the old and new law upon wills—i. e., whether it will alter T. D.'s ideas as to whether it was an estate or tenancy in common for life or in fee, as I have had the question of the limited estate mooted in reference to my inquiry. J. N. C.

COUNTY COURTS—JURISDICTION AGAINST EXECUTORS.

In our county court here, a short time since, an action was brought by a creditor against an executor or an administrator, and the question of jurisdiction was raised, as to whether the creditor could sue here in our county court or whether he ought not to sue in the county court of the place where the grant of probate or letters of administration was given. I have not seen any case upon the point as yet, but it would be attended with great inconvenience if, for instance, the creditor was obliged to sue an executor or an administrator in the Norwich County Court, where we will suppose their power to act was granted, or still worse if grant came from the general Court of Probate. J. N. C.

King's Lynn, Jan. 25, 1862.

Scotland.

Mr. Robert Macfarlane will take his seat on the bench as successor to Lord Wood as soon as the usual formalities are completed. Mr. Macfarlane was called to the bar in 1838, but had practised as a writer to the signet since 1827. He has thus, and by the various character of his practice as an advocate, been made conversant with almost all departments of law. The sheriffship of Renfrewshire, vacated by Mr. Macfarlane's elevation, will be filled by Mr. Patrick Fraser, and Mr. Fraser's office of standing counsel for the Exchequer by Mr. Andrew Rutherford Clark.

Sir Archibald Allison, Bart., on Wednesday evening last, delivered an address to the members of the Juridical Society, in Glasgow. The subject was "On the instances in which the law of England had been borrowed from that of Scotland."

Ireland.

There are ninety-two Queen's Counsel at the Bar in Ireland, of whom fifty are in actual attendance at the courts. Eight of these sought senatorial honours; two were disappointed; two succeeded, and subsequently lost their seats; and four are still in Parliament—Messrs. Whiteide, Macdonagh, George, and Butt. It is said that Mr. Serjeant Sullivan is about to offer

himself for Treace, in the room of Mr. Daniel O'Connell, about to receive a place from Government. Mr. Sullivan is the law adviser of the Government. For his age and standing he is the most successful man at the bar.

The Benchers in this country are a body comprising all the judges of the superior law and equity courts, and such other subordinate judges and such members of the Bar as from high professional and social standing the existing members may think qualified to command the respect of both branches of the legal profession, for which the Benchers make rules, and whose funds they disburse. A large proportion of these are contributed by the solicitors, and though there is no law to exclude them, none of them have been elected in the memory of the present generation. This fact is producing great dissatisfaction among the solicitors; but it is stated that they are determined not to endure their exclusion much longer. To be classed among the Benchers is the next thing in point of honour and distinction to being put upon the Bench.

Foreign Tribunals and Jurisprudence.

FRANCE.

CORPS LEGISLATIF.

COMMITTEE FOR REVISING COMMERCIAL CODE—LEGAL RATE OF INTEREST.

One of the first measures to be submitted to the Corps Législatif is a bill modifying the decree of the 3rd of September, 1807, regulating the legal rate of interest. It is said that the committee appointed by the Minister of Commerce to revise certain clauses of the French Commercial Code have recommended that in future the interest of money shall be regulated by the supply and demand; that is, that the rate shall be left to the appreciation of the parties contracting a pecuniary engagement.

BANKRUPTCY LAWS.

It is stated that the same committee have directed their attention to the existing Bankruptcy Laws. Many of the amendments proposed have been rejected as inopportune and inapplicable. One improvement, however, which has been long called for by merchants and traders, will, it is said, be taken into consideration. Proprietors of houses occupied by traders become bankrupt claim the privilege of being first paid the amount of all rent payable up to the termination of the lease. The consequence is that the entire of the bankrupt's assets are sometimes consumed in indemnifying the landlord, who moreover retains possession of the premises leased to the bankrupt. The committee are of opinion that it is only reasonable to put a limit to such a demand on the part of the landlord, and it is said that the landlord's claim is to be confined to two years' rent.

COMMERCIAL COMPANIES.

The question of commercial companies and the revision of the law of the 17th of July, 1856, have given rise to long discussions in committee. The Minister of Commerce has expressed himself in favour of that law, but he admits that the responsibility of the *conseils de surveillance* should be better defined, so as not to intimidate practical men from accepting such an appointment. M. Blanche, Attorney-General, and Mr. Denière, President of the Chamber of Commerce, have expressed a desire to facilitate the formation of anonymous companies. The constitution of such companies is greatly impeded in France by the formalities to be observed in order to obtain permission for the establishment of such companies. It has been decided, therefore, to adopt the system which regulates the joint stock companies established in England on the principle of limited liability.

PRIVILEGED BROKERS.

The abolition of privileged brokers has been suggested to the committee, but it has not yet been decided. The principle, however, has been admitted. The example of other great commercial nations where such liberty exists has been accepted as an indication of what may be done in France.

AMERICA.

A correspondent of the *Standard*, writing from New York, says that "plunder is not confined to the army. Even the United States judiciary must have its fat things. The court in which all the British prize cases are tried has a nice judge.

In fact, the United States District Court for this section is now for the benefit of one family—the Betts family. The Astors and such families may have incomes from their money. Other families have incomes from their talents and connections. Such is the "Betts" family. Judge Betts has been a judge nearly half a century. His son is clerk of the same court; father and son being judge and clerk, are enabled to work a dark traverse, and make 40,000 dollars a-year out of the clerkship. This same son is also lieutenant-colonel of a regiment of Zouaves, and gets double pay. Judge Betts has a grandson who is deputy clerk of the court—salary, 1,500 dollars. He is yet a youth at college, but he comes to New York, and attends the court during the vacation, twice a year. A nephew of Judge Betts is also deputy clerk. A cousin of Judge Betts is one of the prize commissioners. The law partner of Judge Betts is the other prize commissioner. A nephew of Judge Betts is clerk to the prize commissioners. A son-in-law of Judge Betts is the auctioneer to the prize commissioners.

It would not be amiss if the British Minister at Washington should call the attention of Mr. Lincoln to this family district court. It is well worth while to see how many British vessels are condemned by the judge in order to throw business into the hands of his relations—the prize commissioners, the auctioneers, and the clerks."

The Hon. E. M. Stanton has been appointed Secretary of the Army. It is, however, considered doubtful whether the senate will confirm the appointment. Mr. Stanton is a lawyer, and has been for many years a resident of Pittsburgh, in Pennsylvania. He acquired in his profession a reputation for great ability, industry, and administrative skill, and those who are best acquainted with him unite with those who know him by reputation only, in according the highest praise to his personal character, honour, and integrity. Mr. Stanton was Attorney-General in the cabinet of Mr. Buchanan, at the close of the last administration, and was then distinguished for his firm and patriotic course which he adopted.

In the United States District Court, on the 14th ult., the case of the British prize vessel *Cashmere* was heard. The District Attorney called on an order to show cause in this case why the cargo of the above vessel should not be appraised and sold, and the proceeds paid into court to abide the final event of the suit.

Mr. Edwards, on behalf of the claimants, opposed the application, and submitted affidavits against it.

United States Assistant District Attorney Woodford replied, urging that the affidavits showed the cargo to be perishing, and that under the circumstances it was unjust alike to the claimants and the captors to allow the cargo to waste away pending the lingering delays of an appeal to the Circuit and thence to the Supreme Court. He admitted that much favour should be shown to the private claimants of the cargo, but added that the naval officers who made the capture in their efforts to enforce the blockade, were also entitled to consideration at the hands of the Court, and especially was this the case when the Court, by its pronounced opinion, had held this vessel and cargo to be lawful prize. The Judge, after hearing the arguments, ordered the sale, and directed that the entering of the final decree be stayed until the execution and return of the order of sale.

Judge William T. Barron, of the Probate Court, Chicago, was recently killed in an accident on the Michigan Central Railroad.

A NEW MISDEMEANOUR.

Mr. W. W. Harper, of Alexandria, member of the dry goods house of Harper & Brother, was recently arrested, charged with "refusing to sell goods and give specie change for United States treasury notes at less discount than five per cent." He made the refusal to a negro boy who had bought some calico. He was arrested at the instance of a United States' officer, and taken before the Provost-Marshal, who referred the case to the Military Governor, General Montgomery. General Montgomery has decided that all persons are liable to arrest and punishment who depreciate United States' treasury notes or embarrass their circulation. An enlargement of military prisons under this rule will be immediately called for.

Reviews.

The Romance of the Forum; or Narratives, Scenes, and Anecdotes from Courts of Justice. By PETER BURKE, Sergeant-at-Law, Author of "Celebrated Trials connected with the Aristocracy," &c. Hurst & Blackett.

Mr. Serjeant Burke has, in the volume before us, contrived to produce a work of exciting interest to the public, and at the same time, of considerable value to the professional lawyer. His former work, "Celebrated Trials," surpassed in interest the volume of celebrated criminal trials which Lady Duff Gordon translated from the German. It was, however, altogether devoted to the aristocracy. The present one includes a great variety of cases which are remarkable, either on account of the peculiarity of the crime, the evidence, or the mode of trial. In the two latter respects the volume contains some interesting studies for young practitioners in criminal law. The learned author manages to convey information in a very agreeable manner, and has shown great judgment and tact in the selection of the cases which he brings before the reader. We ought not to omit mentioning that the present edition contains the true story of the "Colleen Bawn," in which Mr. Serjeant Burke clears away much of the romance which was thrown round the cruel murder which happened forty years ago on the broad waters of the Shannon.

Societies and Institutions.

BIRMINGHAM LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of this Society was held at the Midland Institute on the 29th ult., George Harris, Esq., Deputy-Judge of the County Court, presiding. The following gentlemen, among others, were present:—Messrs. H. W. Tyndall, W. Morgan, C. T. Saunders, G. J. Johnson, C. E. Mathews, T. Horton, A. Simcox, J. Walford, J. Chirn, S. Balden, jun., A. E. Greenway, J. Jelf, and E. Swinlen, honorary members; Messrs. M. T. Blewitt, J. G. Bradbury, W. Fallows, A. H. Foster, M. Maher, T. Y. Moilliet, J. D. Finson, G. G. Pole, Lilly Smith, T. H. Stanley, and E. L. Tyndall, ordinary members. The report read by Mr. Lilly Smith stated that there was a balance of £13 19s. 7d. in favour of the Society—that the moot points debated during the year had been as usual of a strictly legal character, embracing a variety of questions selected with a view to the development of principles, and as auxiliary to the general course of a law students' reading; meetings had been better attended; that among the books added to the library were "The Life of Lord Hardwicke," and "The Theory of Representation," presented by the learned author, the chairman of the meeting.

Professor JOHNSON, in moving the adoption of the report, said it was simply enough to say that the usefulness of a society which was commenced some thirteen years ago by half-a-dozen law students, was abundantly shown by the fact that so many who had derived advantages from it were there to celebrate its anniversary. The Society had now seen some four generations of articulated clerks, and its library was, without any disparagement to the older library of the Law Society, well stocked with works of a more useful character to the students. He therefore had the greatest possible pleasure in moving the adoption of a report which recorded the continued usefulness of the Society. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jelf, who bore testimony to the advantages he had derived from his early connection with the society; and it was then put and carried unanimously.

Mr. C. SWINLEN then moved, "That the thanks of the meeting be accorded to the patrons and honorary members of the society for their continued patronage and support." In doing so he testified the pleasure and satisfaction he, in common with his fellow-students, felt at the assistance given them by the gentlemen named in the resolution.

Mr. M. MAHER, in seconding the resolution, adverted to the many eminent gentlemen who had honoured the society with their patronage, and spoke of the benefits that had accrued to the students thereby. The resolution was then put, and carried unanimously.

Mr. W. MORGAN acknowledged the compliment.

Mr. C. E. Mathews, Mr. J. Walford, Mr. C. T. Saunders, and Mr. H. W. Tyndall also addressed the meeting; and

The learned CHAIRMAN then delivered his address, of which the following is an abstract:—"Gentlemen, I have much

pleasure in meeting you this evening, and I feel highly honoured by being asked to take the chair at your annual meeting. In no town does the legal profession stand higher, both as regards its intelligence and its moral bearing, than in Birmingham. This society is eminently adapted to sustain that character; and I am glad to observe from a perusal of the reports of the committee, for 1860 and 1861, not only that the society itself is in a prosperous condition, but that during the last few years several of its junior members have been highly distinguished, and have obtained prizes on account of their examinations. The society which I am now addressing may be regarded as representative of the general body of young solicitors in the empire, and certainly no body in the community has so extensive an influence, whether for good or for evil, as that which is possessed by the legal profession, more especially that branch of it to which you belong. Your power over others is necessarily very great, because to you they entrust, to a large extent, the management of their affairs. The administration of justice is in many essential respects conducted entirely by you. The prosperity of those with whom you are professionally connected is greatly dependent on your intelligence and integrity. In every calling, however, I hold that the perpetration of crime will be in pretty exact proportion to the temptations to commit evil. In a profession which boasts so many members as does that of the law, and the avocations of which hold out more temptations than do those of any other, it would be unreasonable to expect, unless we could change human nature altogether, that no unworthy members should be found among its ranks. These, however, are, I feel, very few indeed in proportion to the numbers of its members, and fewer still, if we bear in mind the temptations to do wrong, and the facilities for effecting it open to the legal profession. At all periods of its history, I am convinced that in no profession can there be found instances of more sterling integrity, more noble disinterestedness, and more genuine philanthropy, than is observable among the members of that to which we have the honour to belong. As the character of the profession rises, whether as regards intelligence or integrity—and in both these respects I am confident that it is rapidly rising—will its influence proportionably advance, and the more beneficial to society at large must be also that influence. The law, if rightly regarded and duly followed, must be regarded as one of the first and noblest of sciences; and to be engaged in which any man, however great his abilities, however lofty his aspirations, may well be proud. Some of the greatest abilities which the world has ever witnessed have been exercised in this pursuit; and to the settlement of its grand and leading principles the most philosophical minds have been devoted. The loftiest ends are arrived at here, in the promotion of justice and the investigation of truth. The real cause of its being so narrowly surveyed, is its own vastness. Burke, who was at once the most comprehensive of statesmen, the most philosophical of constitutional writers, and the most eloquent of orators, speaks of the ennobling nature of the law as a study, and its tendency to enlarge and invigorate the mind, although he remarks that it has sometimes engendered narrow views. It is only as a system of grand principles that the law is entitled to be considered as a great science. A man who regards the law as a mere collection of registered decisions, placed under different heads, and which may be turned to at convenience to meet any particular case, has no right to claim that he pursues the law as a science, any more than a person who looks upon his profession solely as a means of making money. In considering the law as a science, we must regard it as a complete system of principles applicable to all the exigencies of social life, and by which all questions relating either to duty or property may be determined according to the rules of strict justice; and the truth regarding each controversy relating to a matter of this kind fully investigated, and in the purest mode. It is alone by demonstrating that it is fitted to engage in its investigation the highest efforts of reason, that the law can be entitled not only to be ranked among the sciences, but to be regarded as one of the very first and noblest of them all. You have a full attestation of the truth of what I am now stating in the leading judgments of those who have been the greatest ornaments to our profession, particularly those of Lord Hardwicke, Lord Mansfield, and Lord Ellenborough. In our own day, too, some of the judgments that have been delivered have contained very noble and scientific expositions of leading principles, especially those of Lord Brougham and Baron Parke, now Lord Wensleydale. The learned Chairman then went on to point out in what particular branches the learned judges he had mentioned had excelled, and to show how many of them had been schooled at

first as attorneys. He also adverted to the legal knowledge of great writers who were not members of the profession, and then proceeded:—We have lately had afforded to us a distinguished example as regards the study of the law, especially of its grand and leading principles, in the case of the late lamented Prince Consort, whose connection with the town of Birmingham, from the deep interest which he evinced in its welfare, and from his repeated visits among us, we are all proud to reflect upon. As a law student at Bonn, he displayed an energy and an application which law students at Birmingham may fairly emulate. Our admirable Queen is distinguished not only for her acquaintance with the principles of the constitution of this country, but for her strict regard to those principles; and her conduct in all the relations of life which she has been called upon to fill has rendered her worthy of being regarded as a model not only as a Queen but as a woman. Both the late Prince Consort and the Prince of Wales have been made members of the legal profession. But although honorary members only as regards their not intending to practise, their study of its leading principles has been as real and as persevering as that of any young student who relied upon the profession for earning his livelihood. On this ground, and on this ground only, I think that the Benchers of Lincoln's Inn and the Middle Temple did themselves much honour by calling to the Bar those illustrious princes. Having said thus much on the study of the law, and of the works of those great writers who were not members of the legal profession; touching on legal topics, I ought perhaps to say a few words as to the general studies and subjects of pursuit desirable for a lawyer to follow, and which are both adapted alike to qualify him most fully for the practice of his profession, and also to render him a useful and honourable member of society. In the conduct of cases both in law and equity, scientific and artistic knowledge will often be found of the utmost value, and in the general conduct of his profession, almost every kind of information may be turned to account. To every lawyer, a knowledge of the principles of government generally, and of those of the British Constitution, is of course essential; and with this, an acquaintance also with the constitutional and general history of his country, and also of that of other nations. Indeed, studies such as these directly aid instead of interfere with our legal studies. But there are other studies hardly less essential both for capacitating us to the full for the pursuit of legal studies, and also for preparing us for the important duties in which our profession engages us. It is of great importance here to continue the pursuit of those studies in which we were engaged during the progress of our education; to consider that education not as terminating with our school or college career, but as then only commencing, to be carried on through life, and ever turned to the fullest account as opportunities offer."

IN RE THE TRENT.—EARL RUSSELL'S ARGUMENT ON INTERNATIONAL LAW.

COPIES OF CORRESPONDENCE WITH HER MAJESTY'S MINISTER IN THE UNITED STATES.

Earl Russell to Lord Lyons.

Foreign Office, January 23, 1862.

MY LORD,—I mentioned, in my despatch of the 10th inst., that her Majesty's Government differed from Mr. Seward in some of the conclusions at which he had arrived; and that I should state to you on a future occasion wherein these differences consisted. I now proceed to do so.

It is necessary to observe that I propose to discuss the questions involved in this correspondence solely on the principles of international law. Mr. Seward himself, speaking of the capture of the four gentlemen taken from on board the *Trent*, says: "The question before us is whether this proceeding was authorized by and conducted according to the law of nations." This is, in fact, the nature of the question which has been, but happily is no longer, at issue. It concerned the respective rights of belligerents and of neutrals. We must, therefore, discard entirely from our minds the allegation that the captured persons were rebels, and we must consider them only as enemies of the United States at war with its Government, for that is the ground on which Mr. Seward ultimately places the discussion. It is the only ground upon which foreign Governments can treat it.

The first inquiry that arises, therefore, is, as Mr. Seward states it, "Were the persons named, and their supposed despatches, contraband of war?"

Upon this question her Majesty's Government differ entirely from Mr. Seward.

The general right and duty of a neutral Power to maintain its own communications and friendly relations with both belligerents cannot be disputed. "A neutral nation," says Vattel,* "continues with the two parties at war, in the several relations Nature has placed between nations. It is ready to perform towards both of them all the duties of humanity, reciprocally due from nation to nation." In the performance of these duties on both sides, the neutral nation has itself a most direct and material interest; especially when it has numerous citizens resident in the territories of both belligerents; and when its citizens, resident both there and at home, have property of great value in the territories of the belligerents, which may be exposed to danger from acts of confiscation and violence if the protection of their own Government should be withheld. This is the case with respect to British subjects during the present civil war in North America.

Acting upon these principles, Sir William Scott, in the case of the *Caroline*,† during the war between Great Britain and France, decided that the carrying of despatches from the French Ambassador resident in the United States to the Government of France by an United States' merchant ship was no violation of the neutrality of the United States in the war between Great Britain and France, and that such despatches could not be treated as contraband of war. "The neutral country," he said "has a right to preserve its relations with the enemy, and you are not at liberty to conclude that any communication between them can partake, in any degree, of the nature of hostility against you. The enemy may have its hostile projects to be attempted with the neutral State, but your reliance is on the integrity of that neutral State, that it will not favour nor participate in such designs, but, as far as its own councils and actions are concerned, will oppose them. And if there should be private reasons to suppose that this confidence in the good faith of the neutral State has a doubtful foundation, that is matter for the caution of the Government, to be counteracted by just measures of preventive policy; but it is no ground on which this Court can pronounce that the neutral carrier has violated his duty by bearing despatches, which, as far as he can know, may be presumed to be of an innocent nature, and in the maintenance of a pacific connection." And he continues shortly afterwards: "It is to be considered also, with regard to this question, what may be due to the convenience of the neutral State; for its interest may require that the intercourse of correspondence with the enemy's country should not be altogether interdicted. It might be thought to amount almost to a declaration that an Ambassador from the enemy shall not reside in the neutral State if he is declared to be debarred from the only means of communicating with his own. For to what useful purpose can he reside there without the opportunities of such a communication? It is to much to say that all the business of the two States shall be transacted by the Minister of the neutral State resident in the enemy's country. The practice of nations has allowed to neutral States the privilege of receiving Ministers from the belligerent States, and the use and convenience of an immediate negotiation with them."

That these principles must necessarily extend to every kind of diplomatic communication between Government and Government, whether by sending or receiving Ambassadors or Commissioners personally, or by sending or receiving despatches from or to such Ambassadors or Commissioners, or from or to the respective Governments, is too plain to need argument; and it seems no less clear that such communications must be as legitimate and innocent in their first commencement as afterwards, and that the rule cannot be restricted to the case in which diplomatic relations are already formally established by the residence of an accredited Minister of the belligerent Power in the neutral country. It is the neutrality of the one party to the communications, and not either the mode of the communication or the time when it first takes place, which furnishes the test of the true application of the principle. The only distinction arising out of the peculiar circumstances of a civil war and of the non-recognition of the independence of the *de facto* Government of one of the belligerents, either by the other belligerent or by the neutral Power, is this: that "for the purpose of avoiding the difficulties which might arise from a formal and positive solution of these questions, Diplomatic Agents are frequently substituted, who are clothed with the powers and enjoy the immunities of Ministers, though they are not invested with the

representative character, nor entitled to diplomatic honours." Upon this footing Messrs. Mason and Slidell, who are expressly stated by Mr. Seward to have been sent as pretended Ministers Plenipotentiary from the Southern States to the Courts of St. James' and of Paris must have been sent, and would have been if at all received; and the reception of these gentlemen upon this footing could not have been justly regarded, according to the law of nations, as a hostile or unfriendly act towards the United States. Nor, indeed, is it clear that these gentlemen would have been clothed with any powers, or have enjoyed any immunities beyond those accorded to diplomatic agents not officially recognised.

It appears to her Majesty's Government to be a necessary and certain deduction from these principles, that the conveyance of public agents of this character from Havana to St. Thomas on their way to Great Britain and France, and of their credentials or despatches (if any) on board the *Trent*, was not and could not be a violation of the duties of neutrality on the part of that vessel: and, both for that reason, and also because the destination of these persons and of their despatches was *bona fide* neutral, it is in the judgment of her Majesty's Government clear and certain that they were not contraband.

The doctrine of contraband has its whole foundation and origin in the principle which is nowhere more accurately explained than in the following passage of Bynkershoek. After stating in general terms the duty of impartial neutrality he adds:—"Et sane id, quod modo dicebam, non tantum ratio docet, sed et usus, inter omnes fere gentes receptus. Quamvis enim libera sint cum amicorum nostrorum hostibus commercia, non tamen placuit, ne alterutrum his rebus, juvenus, quibus bellum contra amicos nostros instruat et foveatur. Non licet igitur alterutri advehere ea, quibus in bello gerendo opus habet; ut sunt tormenta, arma, et quorum precipuus in bello usus, milites. . . . Optimo jure interdictum est, ne quid eorum hostibus subministremus; quia his rebus nos ipsi quodammodo videremur amicis nostris bellum facere."

The principle of contraband of war is here clearly explained, and it is impossible that men, or despatches, which do not come within that principle, can in this sense be contraband. The penalty of knowingly carrying contraband of war is, as Mr. Seward states, nothing less than the confiscation of the ship; but it is impossible that this penalty can be incurred when the neutral has done no more than employ means usual among nations for maintaining his own proper relations with one of the belligerents. It is of the very essence of the definition of contraband that the articles should have a hostile, and not a neutral, destination. "Goods," says Lord Stowell,‡ "going to a neutral port, cannot come under the description of contraband, all goods going there being equally lawful. The rule respecting contraband," he adds, "as I have always understood it, is, that articles must be taken in *delicto*, in the actual prosecution of the voyage to an enemy's port." On what just principle can it be contended that a hostile destination is less necessary, or a neutral destination more noxious, for constituting a contraband character in the case of public agents or despatches than in the case of arms and ammunition?

Mr. Seward seeks to support his conclusion on this point by a reference to the well-known dictum of Sir William Scott in the case of the *Caroline*, "that you may stop the Ambassador of your enemy on his passage;§" and to another dictum of the same judge, in the case of the *Orozembo*, that civil functionaries "if sent for a purpose intimately connected with the hostile operations,|| may fall under the same rule with persons whose employment is directly military."

These quotations are, as it seems to her Majesty's Government, irrelevant. The words of Sir W. Scott are, in both cases, applied by Mr. Seward in a sense different from that in which they were used. Sir William Scott does not say that an Ambassador, sent from a belligerent to a neutral State, may be stopped as contraband while on his passage on board a neutral vessel belonging to that or any other neutral State; nor that if he be not contraband, the other belligerent would have any right to stop him on such voyage. The sole object which Sir William Scott had in view was to explain the extent and limits of the doctrine of the inviolability of Ambassadors, in virtue of that character; for he says:—

"The limits that are assigned to the operations of war against them, by Vattel and other writers upon these subjects,

* Vattel, book iii, chap. 7, s. 118.

† The *Caroline* (Chr. Rob., 481); cited and approved by Wheaton ("Elements," part iv., chap. 3, sec. 23).

§ Wheaton: "Elements," part iii., chap. 1, sec. 5.

¶ Bynkershoek: "Quest. Jur. Publ.," lib. 1, cap. 2.

‡ The *Jaquin*, 3 Chr. Rob. 167.

§ The *Caroline*, 6 Chr. Rob. 468.

|| The *Orozembo*; 6 Chr. Rob. 434.

are, that you may exercise your right of war against them wherever the character of hostility exists. You may stop the Ambassador of your enemy on his passage; but when he has arrived, and has taken upon him the functions of his office, and has been admitted in his representative character, he becomes a sort of middle man, entitled to peculiar privileges, as set apart for the protection of the relations of amity and peace, in maintaining which all nations are in some degree interested."

There is certainly nothing in this passage from which an inference can be drawn so totally opposed to the general tenour of the whole judgment, as that an ambassador proceeding to the country to which he is sent and on board a neutral vessel belonging to that country, can be stopped on the ground that the conveyance of such an Ambassador is a breach of neutrality, which it must be if he be contraband of war. Sir William Scott is here expressing not his own opinion merely, but the doctrine which he considers to have been laid down by writers of authority upon the subject. No writer of authority has ever suggested that an ambassador proceeding to a neutral state on board one of its merchant ships is contraband of war. The only writer named by Sir William Scott is Vattel,* whose words are these:—"On peut encore attaquer et arrêter ses gens" (i.e., gens de l'ennemi) "partout où on a la liberté d'exercer des actes d'hostilité. Non seulement donc on peut justement refuser le passage aux ministres qu'un ennemi envoie à d'autres souverains; on les arrête même, s'ils entreprennent de passer secrètement et sans permission dans les lieux dont on est maître."

And he adds as an example, the seizure of a French ambassador, when passing through the dominions of Hanover during war between England and France, by the King of England, who was also Sovereign of Hanover.

The rule, therefore, to be collected from these authorities is, that you may stop an enemy's Ambassador in any place of which you are yourself the master, or in any other place where you have a right to exercise acts of hostility. Your own territory, or ships of your own country, are places of which you are yourself the master. The enemy's territory, or the enemy's ships, are places in which you have a right to exercise acts of hostility. Neutral vessels, guilty of no violation of the laws of neutrality, are places where you have no right to exercise acts of hostility.

It would be an inversion of the doctrine that Ambassadors have peculiar privileges to argue that they are less protected than other men. The right conclusion is, that an Ambassador sent to a neutral power is inviolable on the high seas, as well as in neutral waters, while under the protection of the neutral flag.

The other dictum of Sir William Scott, in the case of the *Orozco*, is even less pertinent to the present question. That related to the case of a neutral ship which, upon the effect of the evidence given on the trial, was held by the Court to have been engaged as an enemy's transport, to convey the enemy's military officers, and some of his civil officers whose duties were intimately connected with military operations, from the enemy's country to one of the enemy's colonies, which was about to be the theatre of those operations, the whole being done under colour of a simulated neutral destination. But as long as a neutral government, within whose territories no military operations are carried on, adheres to its professions of neutrality, the duties of civil officers on a mission to that government and within its territory cannot possibly be "connected with" any "military operations" in the sense in which these words were used by Sir William Scott, as, indeed, is rendered quite clear by the passages already cited from his own judgment in the case of the *Caroline*.

In connection with this part of the subject, it is necessary to notice a remarkable passage in Mr. Seward's note, in which he says, "I assume in the present case, what, as I read British authorities, is regarded by Great Britain herself as true maritime law, that the circumstance that the *Trent* was proceeding from a neutral port to another neutral port does not modify the right of the belligerent capture." If, indeed, the immediate and ostensible voyage of the *Trent* had been to a neutral port, but her ultimate and real destination to some port of the enemy, Her Majesty's Government might have been better able to understand the reference to British authorities contained in this passage. It is undoubtedly the law as laid down by British authorities, that if the real destination of the vessel be hostile (that is, to the enemy or the enemy's country), it cannot be covered and rendered innocent by a fictitious destination to a neutral port. But if the real terminus of the voyage be bond

side in a neutral territory, no English, nor, indeed, as Her Majesty's Government believe, any American authority can be found which has ever given countenance to the doctrine that either men or despatches can be subject, during such a voyage, and on board such a neutral vessel, to belligerent capture as contraband of war. Her Majesty's Government regard such a doctrine as wholly irreconcilable with the true principles of maritime law; and certainly with those principles as they have been understood in the courts of this country.

It is to be further observed, that packets engaged in the postal service, and keeping up the regular and periodical communications between the different countries of Europe and America, and other parts of the world, though in the absence of treaty stipulations they may not be exempted from visit and search in time of war, nor from the penalties of any violation of neutrality, if proved to have been knowingly committed, are still, when sailing in the ordinary and innocent course of their legitimate employment, which consists in the conveyance of mails and passengers, entitled to peculiar favour and protection from all governments in whose service they are engaged. To detain, disturb, or interfere with them, without the very gravest cause, would be an act of a most noxious and injurious character, not only to a vast number and variety of individual and private interests, but to the public interests of neutral and friendly governments.

It has been necessary to dwell upon these points in some detail, because they involve principles of the highest importance, and because if Mr. Seward's argument were acted upon as sound, the most injurious consequences might follow.

For instance, in the present war, according to Mr. Seward's doctrine, any packet ship carrying a Confederate Agent from Dover to Calais, or from Calais to Dover might be captured and carried to New York. In case of war between Austria and Italy, the conveyance of an Italian Minister or Agent might cause the capture of a neutral packet plying between Malta and Marseilles, or between Malta and Gibraltar, the condemnation of the ship at Trieste, and the confinement of the Minister or Agent in an Austrian prison. So in the late war between Great Britain and France on the one hand, and Russia on the other, a Russian Minister going from Hamburg to Washington, in an American ship, might have been brought to Portsmouth, the ship might have been condemned, and the Minister sent to the Tower of London. So also a Confederate vessel of war might capture a Cunard steamer on its way from Halifax to Liverpool, on the ground of its carrying despatches from Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams.

In view, therefore, of the erroneous principle asserted by Mr. Seward, and the consequences they involve, Her Majesty's Government think it necessary to declare that they would not acquiesce in the capture of any British merchant ship in circumstances similar to those of the *Trent*, and that the fact of its being brought before a Prize Court, though it would alter the character, would not diminish the gravity, of the offence against the law of nations which would thereby be committed.

Having disposed of the question whether the persons named and their supposed despatches were contraband of war, I am relieved from the necessity of discussing the other questions raised by Mr. Seward, namely, whether Captain Wilkes had lawfully a right to stop and search the *Trent* for these persons and their supposed despatches; whether that right, assuming that he possessed it, was exercised by him in a lawful and proper manner; and whether he had a right to capture the persons found on board.

The fifth question put by Mr. Seward, namely, whether Captain Wilkes exercised the alleged right of capture in the manner allowed and recognised by the law of nations, is resolved by Mr. Seward himself in the negative.

I cannot conclude, however, without noticing one very singular passage in Mr. Seward's despatch.

Mr. Seward asserts that "if the safety of this Union required the detention of the captured persons it would be the right and duty of this Government to detain them." He proceeds to say that the waning proportions of the insurrection, and the comparative unimportance of the captured persons themselves, forbid him from resorting to that defence. Mr. Seward does here assert any right founded on international law, however inconvenient or irritating to neutral nations; he entirely loses sight of the vast difference which exists between the exercise of an extreme right and the commission of an unquestionable wrong. His frankness compels me to equally open, and to inform him that Great Britain could not have submitted to the perpetration of that wrong, however flourishing might have been the insurrection in the South, and however important the persons captured might have been.

Happily all danger of hostile collision on this subject has been avoided. It is the earnest hope of Her Majesty's Government that similar dangers, if they should arise, may be averted by peaceful negotiations conducted in the spirit which befits the organs of two great nations.

I request you to read this despatch to Mr. Seward, and give him a copy of it.

I am, &c.
(Signed) RUSSELL.

Law Students' Journal.

CANDIDATES WHO PASSED THE EXAMINATION. HILARY TERM, 1862.

Name of Candidate.	To whom articulated, assigned, &c.
Addison, Joseph	John Linklater.
Alderson, Edward Samuel, B.A.	Thomas Henry Scarborough.
Alderson, Francis Bennet	Philip R. Alderson.
Arnold, Edward	Henry Gray Brydone.
Baxter, Thomas	Thomas Watson.
Bell, William Lawrance	C. Dod; C. F. Phillips; W. Lawrance.
Berger, Lewis John	Charles Norris Wilde.
Birks, Henry	John Prescott Wood.
Borlase, James Skipp	J. J. G. Borlase; J. Roscorla.
Boeuanquet, Walter Henry	Bartle John Laurie Frere.
Brice, Richard	W. W. Dyne; H. Dyne.
Brown, Thomas Parkinson	Thomas Brown.
Burnaby, James Frederick	Godfrey Tallents.
Burton, Alfred Barrand	F. Burton; Geo. D. Warner.
Cammack, William	Charles Foster Bonner.
Chalk, Edmund	George Hicks Seymour.
Chapple, Henry Torrington	John Chapple.
Chidley, Sydney	John Robert Chidley.
Chittock, John Carsey	Geo. A. Dye; Roger Kerrison.
Clough, Joseph	Samuel Lister Booth.
Cooper, Thomas	Frederick Scipio Clarkson.
Coren, Edward Walker	John Burrup.
Cross, William, jun.	William Cross.
Daniel, Owen Fisher	Martin Long Daniel.
Dumville, Peter Williamson	T. B. Dumville; W. H. Mitchell; W. and J. Walker; W. Walker, jun.
Ellis, R. Keate Elves, B.A.	Augustus Bradbury.
Fawcett, William Rhodes	William Fawcett.
Gibson, William	Robert Henry Speed.
Harding, Hugh	Edward Burges.
Hartley, John	Thomas Constable.
Harwar, Richard Henry	William Slater, jun.
Herbert, Charles Henry	Francis Herbert.
Holmes, William	John Mason.
Hortin, John Henry	Thomas Nicks; E. W. Field; Thomas Snape.
Innes, George Rose, jun.	George Rose Innes.
Inskip, James	William Bevan.
James, Evans Luxmoore	C. E. Palmer; John W. Bell.
Kennedy, Reynolds	Thomas Kennedy.
Kruger, Henry James	Charles Fidley; C. Bevan.
Langdon, James	John Roberts Chanter.
Lewis, Albert Calkin	R. B. Postans; G. S. Chevallier.
Lewis, Edward Tyrell	Charles Lewis.
Longley, Frederick Henry	David Williams Wire.
Lys, George Armiston	George Lys.
Markby, Edward Gillam	J. H. Lloyd; W. Gresham.
Moore, Arthur John, jun.	Anthony John Moore.
Nunn, John Joseph, B.A.	Samuel Stone.
Ogle, Herbert Moss	W. Yearley (dec.) W. Evans.
Paddison, Joseph	William Latham.
Pearce, John	Richard Smith.
Phillips, John	Jonathan Rogers Powell.
Pinfield, William Henry	John North.
Piper, James Peter, M.A.	Orlando Hyde.
Freist, John	C. H. Charlton; H. D. Poole.
Ramsden, Hildebrand, B.A.	John Henry James.
Reeves, John Donaldson, B.A.	George Debenham.
Ricketts, William Tyler	William Latham.
Rodgers, George	Charles Rodgers.
Rogers, Thomas Williams	Thomas Rogers.
Sharp, John Andrew	George Capes.
Shipley, J. Aynaley Davidson	John Theodore Hoyle.
Southern, John	Richard Holmes.
Steward, Frederick William	Henry Lloyd.

Name of Candidate.	To whom articulated, assigned, &c.
Swearse, Charles	Henry Symons.
Swift, Thomas	William Cross.
Sykes, John William	W. Barker (dec.); T. Harvey.
Taylor, John	Key Clegg.
Taylor, Reuben	William Sextus Harding.
Taylor, Thomas	John Meadows White.
Tennant, Marmaduke	Richard Heaton.
Ullithorne, Oscar Augustus	George Capes.
Vincent, Charles Greaves	L. Desborough; C. St. Clara Bedford.
Weaver, Wilfred Marrat	Joseph Bridgman.
Whiteford, Hamilton	Charles Cobley Whiteford.
Wilkinson, James Thompson	William Wilkinson.
Williams, John	Alfred Osborne.
Willis, Thomas Price	David Thomas Willis.
Wyatt, George Harvey	J. H. Hearn; Jas. A. Mew.
Yates, John Joseph	John Yates, jun.

EXAMINATIONS AT THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

HILARY TERM, 1862.

At the examination of candidates for admission on the roll of attorneys and solicitors of the superior courts, the examiners recommended the following gentlemen, under the age of 26, as being entitled to honorary distinction:—

JOSEPH ADDISON, aged 21, who served his clerkship to Messrs. J. & J. H. Linklater & Hackwood, of London.

JAMES INSKIP, aged 22, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Bevan, Girling, & Press, of Bristol; and Mr. John White, of London.

WILLIAM RHODES FAWCETT, aged 21, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Fawcett & Garbutt, of Yarm; and Messrs. Bell, Brodrick, & Bell, of London.

WILLIAM TYLER RICKETTS, aged 21, who served his clerkship to Mr. William Latham, of Sandbach.

EDMUND CHALK, aged 21, who served his clerkship to Mr. George Hicks Seymour, of York.

The council of the Incorporated Law Society have accordingly awarded the following prizes and books:—

To Mr. Addison, the prize of the Honourable Society of Clifford's Inn.

To Mr. Inskip, the prize of the Honourable Society of Clement's Inn.

To Mr. Fawcett, one of the prizes of the Incorporated Law Society.

To Mr. Ricketts, one of the prizes of the Incorporated Law Society.

To Mr. Chalk, one of the prizes of the Incorporated Law Society.

The examiners have also certified that the following candidates passed examinations which entitle them to commendation:—

JOHN WILLIAM SYKES, aged 21, who served his clerkship to Messrs. W. and W. E. Barker, of Huddersfield; Mr. Thomas Harvey, of Egham; and Messrs. Cowdell and Boyce, of London.

LEWIS JOHN BROGER, aged 23, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Wilde, Rees, Humphry, and Wilde, of London.

JOHN CARSEY CHITTOCK, aged 23, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Dye and Palmer, of Norwich; and Messrs. Kerrison and Preston, of Norwich.

FREDERICK WILLIAM STEWARD, aged 23, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Bell, Steward, and Lloyd, of London.

WALTER HENRY BOEQUET, aged 23, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Frere, Goodford, Cholmeley, & Forster, of London.

JOHN PHILLIPS, aged 23, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Evans, Powell, & Mathias, of Haverfordwest; and Messrs. Eyre & Lawson, of London.

The Council have accordingly awarded them certificates of merit.

The examiners have further announced to the following candidate that his answers to the questions at the examination were highly satisfactory, and would have entitled him to a prize or a certificate of merit if he had been under the age of 26:—

HENRY BIRKS, aged 28, who served his clerkship to Messrs. J., J. F., & H. Wood, of York.

The number of candidates examined in this term was 88; of these, 79 were passed, and 9 postponed.

LAW LECTURES AT THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY, 1861-62.

Mr. WILLIAM MURRAY, on Common Law and Mercantile Law, Monday, February 3.

Mr. THOMAS HENRY HADDAN, on Equity, Friday, February 7.

Public Companies.

BILLS IN PARLIAMENT

FOR THE FORMATION OF NEW LINES OF RAILWAY IN ENGLAND AND WALES.

The Standing Orders have been complied with in the following cases:—

BIRKENHEAD.

New line from Hooton to Park Gate, in connection with Birkenhead Railway. Surplus moneys of Birkenhead Railway to be applied towards construction.

BIRKENHEAD DOCKS AND WEST CHESHIRE JUNCTION.

New lines from Birkenhead Docks to the West Cheshire system of railways. Capital, £600,000.

BIRKENHEAD, FLINTSHIRE, AND HOLYHEAD.

New lines from Hooton to Queen's Ferry and Chester and Holyhead Railway. Capital, £160,000.

BRISTOL AND CLIFTON.

New line from Bristol to Brandon Hill. Capital, £250,000.

EAST GLOUCESTERSHIRE.

New lines from Cheltenham to Farringdon and Burton-on-the-Water. Capital, £600,000.

EDGWARE, HIGHGATE, AND LONDON.

New line in connection with Great Northern. Capital, £220,000.

GREAT WESTERN.

New line to Smethwick, in connection with the Birmingham, Wolverhampton, and Dudley Railway; another line from Bromwich to Tipton; and a further line commencing at the Hatton Station of the Birmingham and Oxford, and joining the Stratford-on-Avon. Capital, £146,000.

HULL AND HORNSEA.

New line between these places.

LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE.

New lines near Rochdale and Wigan. Capital, £333,000.

LLANELLY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 30th ult., a dividend at the rate of £1 per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

LONDON, CHATHAM, AND DOVER.

New line from Clapham to Battersea, in connection with the West London Extension Railway.

MIDLAND.

New lines in connection with Rowsley and Buxton line. Capital, £380,000.

MOLD AND WREKHAM.

Extensions in Denbigh and Flint. Capital, £120,000.

NORTH DEVON AND OKEHAMPTON.

New line between these places. Capital, £130,000.

RADSTOCK AND KEYNSHAM.

New line between these places.

STAMFORD AND ESSENDINE.

New lines to unite with London and North Western and Midland Railways. Capital, £60,000.

TOTTENHAM AND HAMPSTEAD.

New line from Hampstead Junction to Tottenham, with a branch to Eastern Counties at Tottenham, and a branch from the Great Northern to Hornsey. Capital, £160,000.

WELLINGTON AND CHESHIRE JUNCTION.

New lines to unite the counties of Salop and Chester. Capital, £420,000.

WEST RIDING, HULL, AND GRIMSBY.

New line from Bradford, Wakefield, and Leeds at Wakefield, to the South Yorkshire at Barnby-upon-Don, with branches. Capital, £350,000.

WEYMOUTH AND PORTLAND HARBOUR.

New line from Weymouth to the Isle of Portland. Capital, £100,000.

University Intelligence.

CAMBRIDGE.—JAN. 27.

PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE EXAMINATION.—*RESUS* PROFESSOR OF LAWS.

Examined and approved.—Carroll, Trinity; Legg, St. Peter's; Sculthorpe, St. Peter's. Examiners: J. T. Abdy, LL.D., and Geo. Leapingwell, LL.D.

Court Papers.

Chancery Easter Vacation Order.

Whereas, by the 5th of the Consolidated Orders of the High Court of Chancery, Rule 4, Article 1, it is provided that the Easter Vacation is to commence and terminate on such days as the Lord Chancellor shall every year specially direct: Now I do hereby order that the Easter Vacation for the present year shall commence on Monday, the 31st day of March next, and terminate on Wednesday, the 9th day of April next, both days inclusive, and that this order be entered and set up in the several offices of this court.

(Signed)

WRETHURST, C.

Exchequer of Pleas.

This Court will hold sittings on Tuesday the 4th; Wednesday the 5th; Monday the 10th; Tuesday the 11th; Wednesday the 12th; and Thursday the 18th days of February next, and will at each sitting proceed in disposing of the business then pending in the Paper of New Trials and in the Special Paper. And will also hold a sitting on Thursday, the 27th day of February next, and will, on the said 27th day of February next, proceed in giving judgment in matters then standing for judgment.

Sittings at Nisi Prius, in Middlesex and London, before the Right Hon. Sir FREDERICK POLLOCK, Knt., Lord Chief Baron of Her Majesty's Court of Exchequer, after Hilary Term, 1862.

MIDDLESEX.

Saturday . . .	February 1	
Monday . . .	" 3	
Tuesday . . .	" 4	
Wednesday . . .	" 5	
Thursday . . .	" 6	Special Juries and Common Juries.
Friday . . .	" 7	
Saturday . . .	" 8	
Monday . . .	" 10	
Tuesday . . .	" 11	
Wednesday . . .	" 12	

LONDON.

Thursday . . .	February 18	
Friday . . .	" 14	
Saturday . . .	" 15	
Monday . . .	" 17	
Tuesday . . .	" 18	
Wednesday . . .	" 19	
Thursday . . .	" 20	Special Juries and Common Juries.
Friday . . .	" 21	
Saturday . . .	" 22	
Monday . . .	" 24	
Tuesday . . .	" 25	
Wednesday . . .	" 26	
Thursday . . .	" 27	
Friday . . .	" 28	

The Court will sit at Ten o'clock.

There will be a second court for the trial of Common Jury Causes when necessary.

Queen's Bench.

This Court will, on Saturday the 1st, Monday the 3rd, Friday the 14th, Saturday the 15th, Monday the 17th, and Tuesday the 18th days of February next, hold sittings, and will at such sittings proceed in disposing of the remaining causes in the New Trial, Special, and Crown Papers, and any other matters then pending.

The Court will also hold a sitting on Saturday, the 22nd day of February next, for the purpose of giving judgment in causes and matters previously argued.

Common Pleas.

This Court will, on Thursday the 6th, Friday the 7th, Saturday the 8th, Monday the 10th, and Tuesday the 11th days of February next, hold sittings in Banco, and will proceed with the case in the Special Paper of "The Great Central Gas Consumers' Company v. Clarke," with the cases standing in the old New Trial Paper, and with the remaining cases in the Special Paper of this court; and this Court will also, at such sittings, proceed to give judgment in the cases that will then be standing over for the consideration of the Court.

Spring Circuits of the Judges, 1862.

MIDLAND.

COCKBURN, L.C.J., and WILLIAMS, J.

Oakham, Friday, Feb. 28. Lincoln, Thursday, March 13.
Northampton, Sat., March 1. Derby, Tuesday, March 18.
Leicester, Wednesday, Mar. 5. Warwick, Saturday, Mar. 22.
Nottingham, Saturday, Mar. 8.

OXFORD.

CRAMPTON, J., and CHANNELL, B.

Reading, Thursday, Feb. 27. Shrewsbury, Wednesday, Mar. 19.
Oxford, Saturday, March 1. Hereford, Monday, March 24.
Worcester, Wednesday, Mar. 5. Monmouth, Thursday, Mar. 27.
Stafford, Thursday, March 13. Gloucester, Monday, March 31.

NORTHERN.

WILLES and MELLOR, JJ.

Carlisle, Friday, February 21. York, Thursday, March 6.
Newcastle, Tuesday, Feb. 25. Liverpool, Thursday, Mar. 20.
Durham, Saturday, March 1.

HOME.

ERLE, L.C.J., and WIGHTMAN, J.

Hertford, Tuesday, March 4. Lewes, Monday, March 24.
Chelmsford, Monday, Mar. 10. Kingston, Monday, March 31.
Maidstone, Monday, March 17.

WESTERN.

BYLES, J., and BLACKBURN, J.

Winechester, Thurs., Feb. 27. Taunton, Saturday, March 29.
Dorchester, Wed., March 5. Dorizes, Thursday, March 20.
Exeter, Saturday, March 8. Bristol, Thursday, March 20.
Bodmin, Saturday, March 15.

Births, Marriages, and Deaths.

BIRTHS.

ALLEN—On Jan. 29, the wife of William Simmons Allen, Esq., solicitor, Birmingham, of a daughter.
CHAMPTION—On Jan. 24, at Noira Lodge, Denmark-hill, the wife of Charles Chamption, Esq., solicitor, of a daughter.
KENT—On Jan. 30, at Kidderminster, the wife of Arthur Kent, Esq., solicitor, of a son, stillborn.

MARRIAGES.

LAMB—LEE—On Jan. 21, Samuel Lamb, Esq., surgeon, Stourport, to Marian, daughter of Thomas Lee, Esq., solicitor, Wakefield.
MURPHY—GRAY—On Jan. 27, John Patrick Murphy, Esq., barrister-at-law, son of P. M. Murphy, Esq., Q.C., Chairman of Quarter Sessions for the county of Cavan, to Elizabeth Margaret, daughter of the late John Gray, Esq., of Calcutta.

DEATHS.

STEPHEN—On Jan. 31, aged 11 months, Margaret Emily, youngest child of J. Fitzjames Stephen, Esq., barrister-at-law.

London Gazettes.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

Friday, Jan. 24, 1862.

Day & Washington, 13 High-st., Stourbridge, and Kingswinford, Attorneys and Solicitors. By mutual consent. Jan 17.

Windings-up of Joint Stock Companies.

Friday, Jan. 24, 1862.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Agriculturist Cattle Insurance Company.—The Master of the Rolls will proceed, on Feb. 3, at 12, to settle the list of contributories of this company, so far as relates to the persons included therein whose surnames begin with the letters A., B., or C.
Defender Fire and Life Insurance Company.—Creditors to prove their debts on or before Feb. 13, before the Master of the Rolls, who has also appointed Feb. 30, at 3, for hearing and adjudicating upon the claims. Creditors to meet before him on Feb. 23, at 3, for the purpose of appointing creditors' representative.
Times Fire Assurance Company.—Creditors to prove their debts before the Master of the Rolls. Creditors to meet before him on Feb. 17, at 12, for the purpose of appointing creditors' representative.

Tuesday, Jan. 22, 1862.

LIMITED IN BANKRUPTCY.

Folkestone West Cliff Hotel Company (Limited).—Order to wind up, Jan. 24. Samuel E. W. Edwards, 23 Basinghall-st., London, was appointed official liquidator.
Haddfields Patent Cask and Package Company (Limited).—Mr. Com. Perry, Liverpool, will, on Feb. 8 at 11, proceed to make a call upon the claimants for 30s. per share in addition to the call of 14s. previously made.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vic. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claims.

Friday, Jan. 24, 1862.

Atkinson, John, 39 St. Peter's-sq., Hammer-smith, Middlesex, Esq. March 3. Sols Smith, Albion, & Smith, 4 Warford-st., Trowmorton, N. London.
Barlow, William, late of Nottingham, Gent., and previously of 113 Wood-st., Chancery, London, Lace Dealer. March 1. Sol Morley, Thread-st., Nottingham.
Barry, William, 3 Rusin-villas, New-rd., Hammer-smith, Middlesex, Gent. March 1. Sol Guillaume, 14 George-st., Mansion House.
Beaumont, Henrietta Jane Emma Hawkes, 24 St. James's-pl., Westminster, Widow. March 1. Sols Bell, Brodick, & Bell, 9 Bow Church-yard, London.
Bonsell, George, Moasham, Derby, Yeoman. April 23. Sol Haxby, 11 Belvoir-st., Leicester.
Bragg, James, Corne Abbas, Dorset, Tailor and Mercer. Feb. 29. Sols Andrews & Cockran, Dorchester.
Crosby, Richard, Cottesley Hall, Beeston, Leeds, Farmer. March 25. Sols Payne, Eddison, & Ford, 70 Albion-st., Leeds.
Firth, Daniel, 77 Sterling-st., Manchester-rd., Bradford, Woolstapler. Feb. 14. Sol Cater, 13 Piece-hall-yard, Bradford.
Greene, Henry, Rolleston-hall, Leicester, Esq. April 1. Sols Robinson & Barlow, 26 Essex-st., Strand.
Hughes, Rev. Henry Alwright, Nichols Nymet, North Tawton, Devon, Clerk. March 20. Sols H. & B. J. Ford, 25 Southway, Essex.
Hutchinson, Grace, formerly of the City of York, but late of Tooting-hill, Kensington, Middlesex, Widow. April 30. Sol Sadler, 25 Goulton-sq., London.
Leigh, Capel Hanbury, Pontypool-park, Esq., Lord Lieutenant of Monmouth. April 1. Sols Robinson & Barlow, 26 Essex-st., Strand.
Lovell, Sir Seymour Benjamin, 4 Upper Seymour-st., Portman-sq., Middlesex, and 27 Brunswick-ter, Brighton, Knight Commander of the Bath, and a Lieutenant-General of her Majesty's Army. March 19. Sols Flaggate, Clarke, & Finch, 40 Craven-st., Strand.
Millard, James, Dudley, Grocer. Sol Lowe, 4 Union-st., Dudley.
Robinson, Mary, Denmark-hill, Surrey, Widow. Feb. 23. Sols Drace & Sons, 19 Billiter-sq., London.
Shepherd, Caleb, 18 Saville-pl., Mile-end, Middlesex, and Spectacle-alley, Whitechapel, Middlesex, Dealer in Earthenware and Glass. March 20. Sol Prentice, 338, Whitechapel.
Smart, Charles, Rothwell, Northampton, Wheelwright. Feb. 5. Sols Andrews & Buswell, Market Harborough.
Strother, Catherine, formerly of Darlington, Durham, and late of New Villa, Forest Gate, Essex, Widow. March 1. Sols Dodd & Trotter, Stockton.
Stuart, Mrs. Letitia, 13 Bolton-row, Piccadilly, Middlesex, Widow. March 1. Sols Farrer, Cuvry, & Farrer, 65 Lincoln's-inn fields.
Vallance, Henry, Elm Villa, 3 Cotham-park, Bristol. March 7. Sol Bryan, 3 Small-st., Bristol.
Tuesday, Jan. 22, 1862.
Brien, Henry, Feltham, Middlesex, Esq. March 20. Sols Symas, Tussdale, & Sandlands, Fenchurch-st.
Brooksbank, William, Low Hall, Mill-yard, Leeds, Flax Spinner. March 31. Sols North & Son, Leeds.
Clark, Francis, Noddy-cottage, Hampstead, Middlesex, Esq. March 31. Sols Bircham, Dalrymple, & Drake, 45 Parliament-st., Westminster.
Davies, John, 23 Highfield-st., Liverpool, Master Mariner. March 31. Sol Jones, 58 Castle-st., Liverpool.
Grundy, William Morris, Sutton-Coldfield, Warwickshire, Merchant. Feb. 20. Sols Alcock & Milward, 5 Union-st., Birmingham.
Harley, Job, Claverley, Salop, Innkeeper. March 25. Sols Gordon & Nicholls, Bridgnorth.
Hartley, Thomas, Great Malvern, Worcestershire, Stationer. March 25. Sols Cawley & Whitley, Great Malvern.
Harris, George Harman, Island of Eustan, Bay of Honduras, Central America, Assistant Surgeon. June 22. Sol Sargent, 13 Wellington-sq., Hastings.
Hudson, Charles, Blyth, Nottinghamshire, Farmer and Cattle Dealer. March 25. Sols Burnaby & Denman, East Retford.
Ketterer, Oswald William, formerly of Bombay, but late of Nozley Villa, Torquay, Devonshire, Esq. March 1. Sol Chapple, 19 Great Carver-lane, Doctor's Commons.
Mitchell, George, Heaton Norris, Lancashire, Cotton Manufacturer. March 6. Sol Smith, Stockport.
Oakley, John, late of 12 Piccadilly, Middlesex, Italian Watchmaker, and Gold & Silver, Haddon, Middlesex, and Church Fulverbach, near Shrewsbury. Feb. 23. Sol Finney, 5 Furnival's-inn.

Trower, Thomas, Midhurst, Sussex, Gent. Feb 28. Sol Albery, Midhurst. Reg. Jan 22.
 Wilson, William, Higher Addington, Lancashire, Cotton Manufacturer. Dec 30. Composition. Reg Jan 21.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, Jan. 24, 1862.

Butchell, Edwin Martin Van, 17 Southampton-st, Strand, Middlesex, Surgeon. Feb 8. Indge v. Pendergrass, V. C. Stuart.
 Challis, Elizabeth, 3 Nottingham-st, St. Marylebone, Middlesex, Widow. Feb 27. Rogers v. Harding, V. C. Kindersley.
 Gimblett, Henry, Westbourne-rd, Edgbaston, Warwickshire, Gent. Feb 20. Gimblett v. Gimblett, V. C. Kindersley.
 Morrish, William, 11 Drummond-st, Easton-sq, Middlesex, Cab Proprietor. Feb 24. Morrish v. Morrish, V. C. Kindersley.
 Owen, George, 129 & 123, Oxford-st, Manchester, Draper and Restaurant Keeper, but late Cook of Clare College, Cambridge. Feb 17. Clayton v. Owen, M. R.
 Penfold, Charles, Arundel, Sussex, Ironmonger. Feb 24. Lear v. Penfold, V. C. Wood.
 Tester, William, Roffesbury Cottage, Down-lane, Tumbridge, Road Contractor. Feb 15. Holman v. Tester, M. R.

TUESDAY, Jan. 28, 1862.

Armstrong, John, Shaw-crescent, Sheen, Berks. Feb 5. Brown v. Kains, V. C. Wood.
 Brown, Samuel, Watling-st, London, and 3 Joy-pl, Coburg-rd, Old Kent-rd, Surrey, Sealing Wax Maker. Feb 25. Harlap v. Brown, M. R.
 Grainger, Richard, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Builder. Feb 22. Sharp v. Wright and Grainger v. Wright, M. R.
 Harris, James, Stratford-green, Essex. Feb 10. Becke v. Simpson, V. C. Stuart.
 Kymer, Mary Ann, Streatham, Surrey, Spinster. Feb 21. Willis v. Kymer, M. R.
 Kymer, Elizabeth, Streatham, Surrey, Spinster. Feb 21. Willis v. Kymer, M. R.
 Robertson, Bowen Robert, Hodgstone House, Hodgstone, Pembrokeshire, Esq. Feb 24. Powell v. Phillips, V. C. Wood.
 Sibbert, Giles, Bath, Esq. Feb 18. Sibbert v. Sibbert, M. R.

(County Palatine of Lancaster.)

McLachlan, Duncan, Liverpool, Ship Chandler. Feb 21. McLachlan v. Wilson, Office of Registrar, North John-st, Liverpool.

Assignments for Benefit of Creditors.

FRIDAY, Jan. 24, 1862.

Barrett, George, 247 Tottenham-court-rd, Middlesex, Iron Founder and Smith. Dec 28. Sol McGregor, 10 Site-lane, London.
 Fickard, Charles, Cranswick, Yorkshire, Beerhouse Keeper. Jan 6. Sol Mends, 94 Coltman-st, Kingston-upon-Hull.
 Walton, Thomas, & James Walton, Castletford, Yorkshire, Earthenware Manufacturers. Dec 20. Sol Bradley, Castletford.

TUESDAY, Jan. 28, 1862.

Livingston, Jane, Dyke-rd, Brighton, Widow, Boarding School Proprietor. Jan 7. Sol Penfold & Son, Brighton.
 McMillan, John, 2 Grove-rd, Wakefield, Draper. Jan 23. Sol Mends, 7 Land of Green Ginger, Hull.

Deeds registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

FRIDAY, Jan. 24, 1862.

Bates, George, 131 High-st, Poplar, Middlesex, Cheesemonger. Jan 7. Composition. Reg Jan 21.
 Beaton, John, Masbrough, Rotherham, Yorkshire, and Henry Sandford, Worthing, Sussex, Iron Manufacturers. Dec 27. Arrangement. Reg Jan 21.
 Copland, John, Blackburn, Travelling Draper. Dec 26. Assignment. Reg Jan 22.
 Featherstone, Ann, Bieberich, Grand Duchy of Nassau, Germany, Widow, and Thomas Elder, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Ship Chandlers, Shipowners, Merchants (Featherstone & Elder). Dec 31. Assignment. Reg Jan 22.
 Field, William, Rochdale, Currier and Leather Factor. Dec 30. Assignment. Reg Jan 22.
 Firth, William, Halifax, Carpenter and Timber Merchant (W. Firth & Co.). Dec 23. Assignment. Reg Jan 20.
 Fletcher, Thomas, Sheffield, Painter and Paperhanger. Jan 9. Assignment. Reg Jan 20.
 Freeco, Andre, 7 Grosvenor-st, Grosvenor-sq, Middlesex, Surgeon, Dentist. Jan 9. Composition. Reg Jan 21.
 Garthorne, George Samuel, & William Dickinson, North Shields, Drapers. Jan 6. Assignment. Reg Jan 22.
 Greenway, Capel, Downend, Gloucestershire, Painter. Jan 17. Composition. Reg Jan 21.
 Hawksworth, Matthew, Stavely, Derbyshire, Grocer and Carrier. Jan 17. Assignment. Reg Jan 22.
 Hiron, William, Birmingham, Manufacturing Jeweller. Dec 24. Composition. Reg Jan 20.
 Lewis, Thomas Augustus, Walsall, Tobacconist. Dec 26. Assignment. Reg Jan 22.
 Muller, Mark Leopold, 33 St Martin's-le-Grand, London, Watchmaker. Jan 13. Composition. Reg Jan 20.
 Read, William, Coventry, Watch Manufacturer. Jan 1. Composition. Reg Jan 21.
 Reed, William, George-st, York, Builder. Dec 24. Assignment. Reg Jan 20.
 Robinson, Peter, & Jonathan Heap, Northwich, Cheshire, Brewers. Dec 26. Assignment. Reg Jan 22.
 Sage, Thomas, 59 Broadmead, and 53 Stokes-croft, Bristol, Cabins. Maker. Dec 27. Assignment. Reg Jan 22.
 Sari, William, 26 Milner-sq, Middlesex, and John William Williamson, 5 Serle-st, Lincoln's Inn-fields, both late of Gresham-house, Old Broad-

st, London, and Seend, Wiltshire, Ironmasters. Dec 26. Assignment. Reg Jan 22.
 Wilson, William, Higher Addington, Lancashire, Cotton Manufacturer. Dec 30. Composition. Reg Jan 21.

TUESDAY, Jan. 28, 1862.

Bird, Frederick Charles, Hinkley, Leicestershire, Victualler. Dec 23. Conveyance. Reg Jan 25.
 Cole, William, Philbeach, Marles, Pembrokeshire, Farmer. Dec 23. Conveyance. Reg Jan 24.
 Danks, Thomas, Dudley, Stationer. Dec 31. Assignment. Reg Jan 25.
 Feaver, James, Wincanton, Somersetshire, Common brewer. Dec 30. Assignment. Reg Jan 24.
 Fry, Samuel, 53 Prescott-st, Liverpool, Grocer. Jan 22. Assignment. Reg Jan 27.
 German, Charles George, Portsmouth, Custom House Agent. Jan 15. Assignment. Reg Jan 25.
 Graham, William, Bishop Auckland, Innkeeper. Jan 1. Composition. Reg Jan 24.
 Houghton, Frank, 242 Pentonville-rd, Middlesex, Cheesemonger. Dec 30. Composition. Reg Jan 25.
 Hurst, Edward, North Shields, Watchmaker. Jan 14. Assignment. Reg Jan 24.
 Hudson, Christopher, Padham, Lancashire, Grocer. Dec 30. Assignment. Reg Jan 25.
 Jones, Thomas, Velindre, Montgomeryshire, Miller. Jan 18. Assignment. Reg Jan 22.
 Kempster, John, Norwich, Auctioneer. Jan 22. Assignment. Reg Jan 24.
 Miers, John Levy, 26 Aldgate, London, Clothier. Jan 20. Composition. Reg Jan 24.
 Murphy, James, 5 Tabernacle-sq, Finsbury, Middlesex, Coppermith. Jan 2. Assignment. Reg Jan 24.
 Parker, Thomas, 78, Great Ducie-st, Strangeways, Manchester, Draper. Jan 16. Assignment. Reg Jan 24.
 Phipps, James, Cheltenham, Draper. Jan 1. Composition. Reg Jan 25.
 Roes, Richard, Rhygo, Glamorganshire, Grocer. Jan 21. Composition. Reg Jan 25.
 Stephens, Thomas, Victoria-st, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorganshire, Grocer. Jan 17. Composition. Reg Jan 25.
 Stevens, John, Frinces Riborough, Bucks, General Grocer. Jan 17. Assignment. Reg Jan 25.
 Warburton, Samuel, Queen's-rd East, Chelsea, Middlesex, Clothier. Dec 27. Assignment. Reg Jan 24.
 Winston, David, Carlton Lodge, Wellington-rd, Kenish Town, Middlesex, Surgeon. Jan 11. Arrangement. Reg Jan 24.
 Watson, Peter, Old Broad-st, London, Share Broker. Jan 21. Assignment. Reg Jan 24.

Bankrupts.

TUESDAY, Jan. 21, 1862.

Agate, Henry, Folkestone, Draper. Pet Jan 8. London, Feb 11. Sol Davidson, Bradbury, & Co., Weavers-hall, London.
 Armstrong, William, Riddings, Derbyshire, Lodging-house Keeper. Pet Jan 18. Alfreton, Feb 1. Sol Walker, Belper.
 Atkinson, Titus, Bedale, North Riding, Yorkshire, Hatter. Pet Jan 13. Northallerton, Jan 27. Sol Teale, Leyburn.
 Austwick, Joseph, 64 Great Tower-st, London, Insurance Broker. Pet Jan 18. London, Feb 5. Sol Greig, 2 Verulam-bldgs, Gray's Inn.
 Avis, George, Southborough, near Tunbridge Wells, Builder. Pet Jan 17. London, Feb 4. Sol Doyle, Gray's Inn.
 Bailey, Thomas, Golden Ball, Golden Ball-st, Norwich, Licensed Victualler. Pet Jan 10. Norwich, Jan 27. Sol Sudd, Jan, Norwich.
 Bamford, Henry, Liverpool, Bookseller. Pet Jan 17. Liverpool, Feb 1. Sol Pemberton, Liverpool.
 Banks, Daniel, Lancaster, 67 Upper Stanhope-st, Liverpool, Engineer. Jan 15. Liverpool, Feb 3. Sol Evans, Sol & Sandys, Liverpool.
 Barnett, Morris, 3 Hayfield-pl, Mile End-rd, Middlesex, Photographer. Pet Jan 18. London, Feb 11. Sol Marshall & Son, 13 Hatton-garden.
 Bastable, Eliza, Belgrave House, Landport, Hants, Baker. Pet Jan 17. London, Feb 12. Sol Harrison & Lewis, 6 Old Jewry.
 Bishop, Joseph Wright, Ripon, Corn Factor. Pet Jan 15. Leeds, Feb 3. Sol Unwin, Sheffield.
 Bower, Josiah, 61 Dale-st, Manchester, Insurance Agent. Pet Jan 10. Manchester, Feb 14. Sol Swan, Manchester.
 Bradshaw, Sarah Hill, Birkenhead, Lodging and Boarding House Keeper. Pet Jan 17. Liverpool, Feb 1. Sol Pemberton, Liverpool.
 Bramley, John Booth, Felley, Nottinghamshire, Farmer. Pet Jan 16. Alfreton, Feb 1. Sol Neale, Matlock.
 Branch, John, Felley, Heworth, Durham, Printer. Pet Jan 18. Gateshead, Feb 3. Sol Briggs, Gateshead.
 Brice, Joseph, Erving-lane, Westgate, Exeter, General Dealer. Pet Jan 20. Exeter, Feb 4. Sol Floud, Exeter.
 Brodie, John, Sunderland, Master Mariner. Pet Jan 10. Sunderland, Jan 28. Sol McKee, Sunderland.
 Broomhall, Eliza, Gresham-rd, Great Malvern, Worcestershire, Single Woman. Jan 16. Feb 3.
 Brown, Frederick John, 4 Little Smith-st, Westminster, Middlesex, Carting Agent. Pet Jan 13. London, Feb 4. Sol Sydney, 33 Jewry-st, London.
 Buttress, William, Darlaston, Staffordshire, Butcher. Jan 14. Birmingham, Jan 31. Sol James & Knight, Birmingham.
 Cogswell, Henry Dixon, Old Market-st, Bristol, Pawnbroker. Pet Jan 17. Bristol Feb 3. Sol Barker, Brittan & Son, Bristol.
 Cole, Benjamin, Old Byland, Yorkshire, Farmer. Pet Jan 17. Helmsley, Jan 31. Sol Dale, York.
 Cook, Charles, Liverpool, Master Mariner. Jan 14. Liverpool, Feb 1.
 Cousin, Dennis Louis, Kingswood, near Wootton-under-Edge, Clerk. Pet Jan 14. Bristol, Feb 1. Sol Livist, Bristol.
 Craven, Thomas, Pratt-st, New Leeds, Bradford, Warp Dresser. Pet Jan 17. Bradford, Feb 10. Sol Hutchinson, Bradford.
 Crumpler, Samuel, Lythcott Matavers, Dorsetshire, Farmer. Pet Jan 18. Poole, Feb 3. Sol Oldridge & Barker, Poole.
 Curgewen, John, Treviskey, Verran, Cornwall, Watch and Clock Maker. Jan 11. Bodmin, Jan 29.
 Curie, Richard, sen, 23 Little Guildford-st, Southwark, Commission Tra-

- veller. Pet Jan 17. London, Feb 5. Sol Chipperfield, 3 Trinity-street, Southwark.
- Dickason, Emma, 13 George-st. New Town, Cambridge. Widow. Pet Jan 14 (in forma pauperis). Cambridge, Jan 31. Sol Garratt, Cambridge.
- Dixon, Henry, 47 Brunwick-st. Hackney-rd. Middlesex. Lithographic Writer. Pet Jan 17. London, Feb 5. Sol Wells, Moorgate-st.
- Dehney, Bayfield, Oakham, Rutland, Cordwainer. Pet Jan 16. Oakham, Jan 31. Sol Law, Stamford.
- Dove, Thomas Lowther, Manager of the City Turkish Baths, 5 South-st, Finsbury, Middlesex. Pet Jan 20. London, Feb 7.
- Duncan, Charles, 44 Gibson-st. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Baker. Pet Jan 15. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Feb 13. Sol Hoyle, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
- Eay, Charles, Black Trolley, near Brimsford, Essex, Publican. Pet Jan 17. London, Feb 12. Sol Tarrant, 2 Bond-st, Walbrook.
- Ellis, James William, Stratford Saint Mary, Suffolk, Plumber. Pet Jan 13. Hadleigh, Feb 3. Sol Calvert, East Bergholt.
- Ellis, John, 5a South-mews, South-st, Manchester-sq, Marylebone, Flyman. Pet Jan 17. London, Feb 12. Sol Edwards, 15 St Swithin's-lane, London.
- Ellis, Thomas, Knudshall, Flintshire. Agricultural Implement Maker. Pet Jan 17. St. Asaph, Jan 31. Sol Edwards, Denbigh.
- Emmerton, Thomas, 19 Mile-st, Hoxton, Middlesex, Butcher. Pet Jan 18. London, Feb 5. Sol Henry de Medina, 14 St. Benet's-pl, Gracechurch-street.
- Fahleigh, James, Courtenay Arms Inn, Venn Green, Milton Damerel, Devonshire, Licensed Victualler. Pet Jan 16. Holworthy, Feb 8. Sol Coham, Holworthy.
- Flood, James Lee, 3 St. Loya's, Bedford, Currier and Leather Seller. Pet Jan 16. London, Feb 4. Sol Doyle, 2 Verulam-bldgs, Grays-inn, agent for Eagles, solicitor, Bedford.
- Foot, William Bundoek, 24 Effingham-pl, Ramsgate, Builder. Pet Jan 18. London, Feb 7. Sol Doyle, Gray's-inn, and Morgan, Maidstone.
- Ford, William Barton, 28 King-st, Holborn, Herbalist. Pet Jan 14. London, Feb 5. Sol Philip & Philip, 20 Bucklersbury.
- Freeman, George, 5 Camden-pl, Peckham, Surrey, Commercial Traveller. Pet Jan 17. London, Feb 12. Sol Harcourt, 2 King's-Arms-yd, London.
- Gannon, Thomas, 43 Liguorpend-st, Gray's-inn-rd, Middlesex, Gas Fitter. Pet Jan 18 (in forma pauperis). London, Feb 5. Sol Fenton & Son, Bevois-st, Basinghall-street.
- Garrard, William, 3 London-terrace, Hackney-rd, Middlesex, Shoe Manufacturer. Pet Jan 18. London, Feb 4. Sol Shaen & Rocce, Bedford-row, London.
- Gazard, Robert, Berkeley, Gloucestershire, Timber Dealer. Pet Jan 14. Bristol, Feb 3. Sol Gaisford, Berkeley, and Clifton & Benson, Bristol.
- Gibson, Ann, Dudley, Worcestershire, Widow. Pet Jan 17. Birmingham, Feb 3. Sol Boston, Birmingham.
- Gibson, John, Thos Gibson, and Samuel Gibson, Oldham, Cotton Spinners. Pet Jan 18. Manchester, Feb 1. Sol Marsland, Manchester.
- Goldbloom, Joseph, 116 Duke-st, Liverpool, Watch Maker. Pet Jan 20. Liverpool, Feb 3. Sol Anderson & Collins, Liverpool.
- Gowland, Thomas, Gateshead, Jan 15. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Feb 3. Sol Hoyle, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
- Gray, Edward, Sheffield, Eating House Keeper. Pet Jan 18. Feb 1. Sol Unwin, Sheffield.
- Green, Frederick Robert, Bourn, Lincolnshire, Baker. Pet Jan 17. Bourn, Jan 31. Sol Andrews, Bourn.
- Harrison, John, 4 Acre-lane, Brixton, Surrey, Dissenting Minister. Pet Jan 16. London, Feb 4. Sol Preston, 10 Austin Friars.
- Haworth, George, Clifford-st, Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Manchester, Chemist. Dec 19. Manchester, Jan 31.
- Hek, James, Aberdare, Contractor. Jan 14. Aberdare, Feb 4.
- Hey, James, 45 Green-lane, Halifax, Reed and Head Maker. Pet Jan 17. Halifax, Jan 31. Sol Wavell, Philbrick & Foster, Halifax.
- Higgins, Bartholomew, Newport Pagnel, Licensed Victualler. Pet Jan 15. Newport Pagnel, Feb 1. Sol Jones, Aylesbury.
- Hoare, William, 2 Abbin-pl, Walcot, Bath, Painter, Plumber, Glazier. Pet Jan 9. Bath, Jan 29. Sol Bann, Bath.
- Holmes, Joseph, Chesterfield, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet Jan 18. Leeds Feb 1. Sol Unwin, Sheffield.
- Houghton, Thomas Blacksmith and Farmer. Pet Jan 15. St. Neot's, Jan 30. Sol Eagles, Bedford.
- Howarth, Charles, Salford-st, Broughton-rd, Salford, Brick Maker. Jan 16. Salford, Feb 1.
- Hughes, William, 52n Inn, Brecon, Licensed Victualler. Pet Jan 16. Bristol, Feb 11. Sol Smith, Merthyr Tydyl, and Abbot, Lucas, & Leonard, Bristol.
- Hurley, Samuel, Canton, near Cardiff, Butcher. Jan 14. Bristol, Feb 4. Sol Brittan, Bristol.
- Hutchison, David, 45 West-sq, Southwark, Surrey, Stone Mason. Pet Jan 17. London, Feb 5. Sol Weeks, 1 Falcon-sq, City.
- Hyett, Edwin, 297 Bute-st, Cardiff, Sugar Boiler. Pet Jan 17. Cardiff, Feb 3. Sol Wilcocks, Cardiff.
- Jackson, John Julian, Oxford-st, Middlesex, and 46 Queen's-rd, Brighton, Dyer and Bleacher. Pet Jan 17. London, Feb 11. Sol King 35 College-hill, London.
- James, Samuel, East Hill, Colchester, Hay Dealer. Pet Jan 17. Colchester, Feb 1. Sol Philbrick, Colchester.
- Jessop, George, King's Arms, Houghton-st, Strand, Middlesex, Licensed Victualler. Pet Jan 18 (in forma pauperis). London, Feb 11.
- Jones, David, Kendig-hill, Glamorgan-shire, Draper. Pet Nov 22 (in forma pauperis). Cardiff, Feb 5. Sol Wilcocks, Cardiff.
- Jones, David, jun., 8 James-st, Swansea, Builder. Jan 14. Swansea, Feb 6.
- Jones, John, Penyboutfaur, Pennant, Montgomery, Farmer, and Thomas Jones, Wemddu, Hlmant, Farmer. Jan 11. Welchpool, Feb 3.
- Jones, Owen, Hand Public House, Eglwysfach, Denbighshire, Publican. Pet Jan 16. Llanrwst, Jan 30. Sol Griffith, Llanrwst.
- Jones, William, York-st, Chester, Brewer. Pet Jan 17. Liverpool Feb 3. Sol Massey, Chester.
- Jordan, James, (not Jordan, as advertised in last Friday's Gazette.) Kennedy, William, 19 Craven-ter, Haywater, Middlesex, Hairdresser. Pet Jan 18. London, Feb 6. Sol Linklater & Co., 7 Walbrook.
- Knight, William Rudd, 1 Short-st, New Western st, Bermondsey, Surrey, Leather Merchant. Pet Jan 16. London, Feb 5. Sol Hand, 23 Coleman-st.
- Leasey, William Weston, Flanivell, near Hurst-green, Sussex, Journey-
- man Painter. Pet Jan 17. Tonbridge Wells, Jan 30. Sol Trustees, Tonbridge-wells.
- Leroy, Alexandre, 64 Gower-st, Bedford-sq, Middlesex, General Merchant. Jan 16. London, Feb 4.
- Lewis, George, Spring Garden-pl, Elizabeth-st, Pimlico, Middlesex. Pet Jan 17 (in forma pauperis). London, Feb 13. Sol Fenton, Bevois-st, Basinghall-st.
- Lewis, Isaac, Arreston, Hlnwath, Pendarrin, Brecon, Coal and Iron Ore Dealer. Jan 14. Bristol, Feb 4. Sol Brittan, Bristol.
- Marah, Charles William, Neptune-pl, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, Fish Merchant. Pet Jan 18. London, Feb 4. Sol Doyle, 2 Verulam-bldgs, Gray's-inn, for Atkinson, Norwich.
- Marsh, William, back of 59 Constitution-hill, Birmingham, Iron Plate Maker and Brasser. Pet Jan 15. Birmingham, Feb 14. Sol Allen, Birmingham.
- Martelli, Benedict, Swansea, General Dealer. Pet Jan 7. Bristol, Feb 4.
- Sols James & Knight, Birmingham, and Henderson, Bristol.
- Martin, James, Abergavenny, Monmouthshire, Grocer's Assistant. Pet Jan 18. Abergavenny, Feb 5. Sol Price, Abergavenny.
- Martin, Robert, 408 Streford-rd, Manchester, Livery Stable Keeper. Jan 14. Manchester Feb 4.
- Mayle, James Gummer, Locomotive Inn, New Swindon, Wiltshire, Inn-keeper. Pet Jan 15. Swindon, Feb 1. Sol Rawlings, Molkham.
- Meechen, Isaac, Starke, otherwise Hayhoe, Halesworth, Suffolk, Clicher. Pet Jan 16. Halesworth, Feb 4. Sol Road, Halesworth.
- Meller, Charles, Nottingham, Dealer in Vegetables. Jan 16. Nottingham, Feb 5.
- Morris, Enoch, Newcastle-st, Burriem, Staffordshire, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet Jan 20. Hanley, Feb 1. Sol Harding, Tamstall.
- Mosley, Thomas, Godmanchester, and Alconbury, Weston, Huntingdonshire, Miller. Pet Jan 17. London Feb 5. Sols Sole, Turner & Turner, Aldermanbury, and Rulland, Peterborough.
- Newton, Thomas, Bush Green, within Lymm, Cheshire, Labourer. Nov 11. Chester, Feb 6. Sol Bent, Warrington.
- Nicholls, William, Queen's-parade, Queen's-rd, Kingston-upon-Thames, Watchmaker. Pet Jan 16. London, Feb 8. Sol Bins, 1 Trinity-sq, Borough.
- Oates, Joseph, Church-lane, Scriven with Tempergate, Knaresborough, Auctioneer. Pet Jan 16. Knaresborough, Feb 13. Sol Harie, Leeds.
- O'Brien, Matthew, 19 Vauxhall-grove, Birmingham, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet Jan 17. Birmingham, Feb 5. Sol Powell & Son, Birmingham.
- Odevaire, Charles Dominique Jacques, 13 Constantia-ter, Sheerness, Lieutenant in her Majesty's Navy. Pet Jan 17. London, Feb 5. Sol Wells, 47 Moorgate-st.
- Oliver, Thomas, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturer. Pet Jan 16. Birmingham, Feb 6. Sol Ashwell, Nottingham.
- Pelerson, George, 100 Wellington-rd, South, Stockport, Cotton Spinner. Pet Jan 15. Manchester, Feb 1. Sols Atkinson, Saunders, & Herford, Manchester.
- Petty, Bolton, Harrogate, Grocer. Pet Jan 16. Knaresborough, Feb 13. Sol Harie, Leeds.
- Pitt, Isaac, & Horatio Lister Fletcher, Iron Merchant, Willenhall, Staffordshire. Pet Jan 17. Birmingham, Feb 3. Sols James & Knight, Birmingham.
- Platt, William, Waterfoot, Newchurch, Rosendale, Coal Merchant. Pet Jan 16. Manchester, Feb 1. Sol Swan, Manchester.
- Please, Thomas, 7 High-st, Exeter, Tailor and Draper. Pet Jan 17. Exeter, Jan 31. Sol Roberts, Exeter.
- Plews, Arthur, Priory Cottage, Elm Grove, Peckham, Surrey, Clerk to an Auctioneer. Pet Jan 17. London Feb 4. Sol Murrough, 16 Warwick-st, Gray's-inn.
- Postlethwaite, William, Rame, Ulverston, Lancashire, Farmer. Pet Jan 17. Manchester, Feb 5. Sols Jackson, Ulverston, and Cobbett & Wheeler, Manchester.
- Pratt, John, Oak-st, 84, Martin at Oak, Norwich, Licensed Victualler. Pet Jan 10. Norwich, Jan 27. Sol Sadd, jun., Norwich.
- Price, William, Tipton, Staffordshire, Journeyman Miner. Jan 14. Stafford, Jan 30.
- Rawles, Benjamin, Chester, 8 Wolf-ter, Dockhead, Bermondsey, Surrey, Boot and Shoe Manufacturer. Pet Jan 16. London, Feb 5. Sol Wood 4 Coleman-st.
- Rawles, Frederick, 11 Bollingbroke-row, Camberwell-rd, Surrey, Boot and Shoe Manufacturer. Pet Jan 16. London, Feb 4. Sol Wood, Coleman-st-bldgs.
- Richards, William, Glove and Shears Inn, Duke-st, Cardiff, Innkeeper. Pet Jan 16. Cardiff, Feb 3. Sol Bird, Cardiff.
- Roberts, Mary, Railway Inn, Abergate, Denbighshire, Publican. Pet Jan 18. Liverpool, Feb 3. Sol Cartwright, Chester.
- Robinson, Charles Maybry, Manchester. Jan 15. London, Feb 4.
- Sackett, John, Ramsgate, Tailor. Pet Jan 14. Ramsgate, Feb 4. Sol Towne, Ramsgate.
- Salesbury, William, Suffolk-rd, Cheltenham, Builder. Pet Jan 17. Bristol, Feb 3. Sol Abbot, Lucas, & Leonard, Bristol.
- Saxton, Leopold Richard, Crich, Derbyshire. Pet Jan 13. Derby, Feb 1.
- Shenton, John, 6 Drummond-ter, Bermondsey, Surrey. Pet Jan 18. London, Feb 6. Sol Moss, 38 Gracechurch-st.
- Silk, Peter Lawrence, 84 Mill-st, Liverpool, Milliner. Pet Jan 13. Liverpool, Jan 31. Sol Husband, Liverpool.
- Sketchley, William, Leicester, Builder. Pet Jan 13. Birmingham, Feb 2. Sol Haxby, Leicester.
- Smith, James, Frederick, Kestrafarm, St. Albans, Farmer. Pet Jan 13. London, Feb 5. Sol Keane, 35 Lincoln's-inn-fields.
- Smith, Joseph, 6 St. John's-ter, St. John's-rd, Clerkenwell, Middlesex, Builder. Pet Jan 18. London, Feb 4. Sols Blakesley & Boswick, 26 Nicholas-lane, Lombard-street.
- Smith, William Deaton, Coatham, North Riding, Yorkshire, Cabinet Maker. Pet Jan 14. Stockton-on-Tees, Jan 30. Sol Thompson, Stockton.
- Strickland, James, 33 James-st, Devonport, Licensed Victualler. Pet Jan 17. Exeter, Feb 1. Sol Chapman, Devonport, or Laidman, Exeter.
- Sturtevant, Buxton, 19 Northampton-sq, Clerkenwell, Middlesex, Manager of an Electro Plate Business. Pet Jan 18. London, Feb 7. Sols Ody & Paddison, 3 New Boswell-st.
- Tate, Rev. Francis, Axminster, Clerk in Holy Orders. Pet Jan 18. Exeter, Feb 8. Sols Donmett & Canning, Chard.
- Thomas, William Edgar, Crumlin, Monmouthshire, Coal Merchant. Dec 17. Monmouth, Feb 3.
- Till, Pearson, 40 Church-st, Chelsea, Middlesex, Collector London General

Omnibus Company. Pet Jan 17. London, Feb 4. Sol Newman, 27 Walbrook.

Tayne, Henry William, Doctor Anderson's, Ashton-rd, Manchester, Chemist & Druggist. Jan 14. Manchester, Feb 1.

Trigg, Benjamin William, Stavely. Pet Jan 17. Chesterfield, Feb 3. Sol Gratton, Chesterfield.

Wadham, Francis, Grenville House, Hornsey-rise, Middlesex, Grocer. Pet Jan 16. London, Feb 5. Sol Howell, 15 Bow-lane, Chelsea.

Wade, Samuel, Thurston, near Barnsley, Grocer. Pet Jan 14. Barnsley, Feb 3.

Walskin, Mary, 11 Aldermanbury, London, and 5 Minerva-st, Hackney-rd, Middlesex, Wholesale Milliner. Pet Jan 17. London, Feb 4. Sol Oliver, 13 Laurence-lane.

Wasson, James, Hulme, Lancashire, Fishmonger. Dec 20. Salford, Feb 1. Sol Gardner, Manchester.

Wells, Francis Ross, 144 Western-road, Brighton, Photographer. Pet Jan 17. Brighton, Feb 4. Sol Goodman, Brighton.

Wheelodon, John, Bosterton, Mayfield, Staffordshire, Cattle Dealer and Innkeeper. Pet Jan 16. Leek, Jan 30. Sols Challinor, Badnall, & Challinor, Leek.

Williams, John, Morriston, near Swansea, Grocer. [Jan 14. Bristol, Feb 4. Sol Britton, Bristol.]

Williams, Eliza Frances, Oxford-st, Unthank's-road, Norwich. Pet Jan 20. London, Feb 6. Sols Doyle, 3 Verulam-bldgs, Gray's-lan, and Atkinson, Norwich.

Worley, John, Codnor, Derbyshire, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet Jan 18. Alfreton, Feb 1. Sol Walker, Belper.

Young, Charles, Queen's-terrace, Southampton, Lodging-house Keeper. Pet Jan 17. Southampton, Feb 3. Sol Mackay, Southampton.

FRIDAY, JAN. 24, 1862.

Acraman, William Edward, 32 Graecchurch-st, London, Merchant. Pet Jan 14. London, Feb 6. Sols Lawrence, Flaws, & Boyer, 14 Old Jewry-chambers.

Adamsen, Thomas, Darlington, Veterinary Surgeon. Pet Jan 20. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Feb 7. Sol Brignal, Durham.

Allen, Theodore, 32 Cloudesty-st, Liverpool-road, Islington, Middlesex. Pet Jan 20. Feb 11. Sols Marsden, 20 Walbrook.

Anderson, Thomas John, 1 Vassall-road, Brixton, Surrey, House Decorator. Pet Jan 20. London, Feb 11. Sol Sorrell, 19 Mark-lane.

Bacon, Isaac, Sharnold, Essex, Joiner. Jan 16. London, Feb 13.

Baker, Thomas, Frutcher, and Charles Clark, Millwright, Horncastle, Lincolnshire. Pet Jan 20. Horncastle, Feb 3. Sol Chambers, Lincoln.

Barr, Andrew William, 95 Borough-road, Southwark, Commercial Agent. Jan 20. London, Feb 5.

Beacon, John, 65 Howard-street, Coventry, Journeyman Plumber. Pet Jan 20. Coventry, Feb 19. Sol Duke, Birmingham.

Bennetts, James, Hafod-gate, Swansea, Tailor. Pet Jan 20. Swansea, Feb 6. Sol Morris, Swansea.

Bolton, John, Eye, Suffolk, Engine Driver. Pet Jan 17. Ipswich, Feb 12. Sol Pollard, Ipswich.

Bonella, James, Dudley, Travelling Draper. Pet Jan 11. Birmingham, Feb 7. Sols Coulton, Dudley, & Wright, Birmingham.

Bourne, William, Longton, Staffordshire, Earthenware Manufacturer. Pet Jan 20. Birmingham, Feb 7. Sols James & Knight, Birmingham.

Bowsher, John, Sheffield, Builder. Jan 14. Leeds, Feb 15.

Bradbury, William, Railway-terrace, Nethells, Birmingham, Coal Dealer. Pet Jan 20. Birmingham, Feb 14. Sol Lowe, Birmingham.

Bradley, Edward, Gospel End, Sedgley, Staffordshire. Pet Jan 18 (in forma pauperis). Stafford, Feb 5. Sol Litchfield, Newcastle-under-Lyne.

Branch, William, Harwich, Essex, Basket Maker. Pet Jan 21. London, Feb 14. Sol Jones, Colchester.

Brindle, Charles, 15 Albert-st, Merthyr-Tydfil, Upholsterer. Pet Jan 20. Merthyr-Tydfil, Feb 4. Sol Forwood, Merthyr-Tydfil.

Besant, John, 35 New-st, Portland-town, Middlesex, Greengrocer. Jan 20. London, Feb 11.

Carr, George, Manchester. Pet Jan 20. Manchester, Feb 4. Sol Grundy, 28 Princess-st, Manchester.

Casale, George, 1 Derby-road, Croydon, Pet Jan 22. London, Feb 7. Sols Lewis & Lewis, Ely-place.

Cheaper, Anthony Jacques, 51 Cleveland-road, Kingsland, Middlesex, Commission Agent. Pet Jan 21. London, Feb 7. Sols Langford & Marsden, 59 Friday-st.

Chippingdale, Josiah, jun., 90 Lower Thames-st, Commission Agent. Jan 18. London, Feb 11.

Clarke, John Newman, Coventry and Stoke, Ribbon Manufacturer. Pet Jan 20. Birmingham, Feb 10. Sols Browett, Coventry, and James & Knight, Birmingham.

Cook, Charles, 33 Princes-road, Notting-hill, Middlesex, Chimney Sweep. Pet Jan 20. London, Feb 4. Sol Wells, 47 Moorgate-st.

Cooper, Nathaniel, Wellington-rd, Handsworth, Staffordshire, Dealer in Gravel. Pet Jan 18. Stafford, Feb 5. Sol Litchfield, Newcastle-under-Lyne.

Corbett, John, 5 Archer-st, Kensington, Middlesex. Jan 20. London Feb 11.

Coswell, Ignacio, Liverpool, Translator of Foreign Languages. Pet Jan 18. Liverpool, Feb 4. Sol Collin, Liverpool.

Cotton, Benjamin, 5 Wapping-wall, St. Paul's-shadwell, Middlesex, Licensed Victualler. Pet Jan 21 (in forma pauperis). London, Feb 8.

Cowell, William Marriage, Great Totham, Essex, Farmer. Pet Jan 22. London, Feb 12. Sol Duffield, 30 Cornhill, and Chelmsford.

Cox, James Lewis, 9 Clarence-st, Plymouth, Painter. Pet Jan 22. East Stonehouse, Feb 8. Sols Edmonds & Sons, Plymouth.

Cullen, Fabian Court, Canterbury. Jan 18. London, Feb 12.

Cummings, George Joseph, Greasbrough, near Rotherham. Jan 15. Rotherham, Feb 7. Sol Mason, York.

Darwood, John, 24 Noll-st, East, Wisbeach St. Peters, Isle of Ely, News Agent. Pet Jan 16. Wisbeach, Feb 6. Sol Ollard, Wisbeach.

Dean, John Smith, Stone, Staffordshire, Journeyman Tailor. Pet Jan 22. Stone, Feb 6. Sol Litchfield, Newcastle-under-Lyne.

Dickens, Frederick William, Red Lion Hotel, Wingham, Kent. Pet Jan 22. London, Feb 7. Sol Mayhew, 21 Carey-street, Lincoln's-inn.

Dobbe, Robert James, Belmont Villas, Twickenham, Surrey, Attorney-at-Law. Jan 20. London, Feb 12.

Doyle, Frederick, 104 Union-st, East Stonehouse, Devonshire, Tailor. Pet Jan 22. East Stonehouse, Feb 8. Sols Edmonds & Sons, Plymouth.

Dogard, William, jun., Lapworth, Warwickshire, Lamp Manufacturer. Pet Jan 17. Birmingham, Feb 10. Sol Webb, Birmingham.

Eardley, William, 18 Lamb-st, Hanley, Stoke-upon-Trent, Clothier. Pet Jan 23. Hanley, Feb 8. Sol Litchfield, Newcastle-under-Lyne.

Elgood, William, 107 Lawley-st, Birmingham, Corn Dealer. Pet Jan 21. Birmingham, Feb 14. Sol Suckling, Birmingham.

Ellison, John, 6 Governor-st, Bedford-sq, Professor of Music. Pet Jan 24. London, Feb 11. Sols Lewis & Lewis, 10 Ely-pl, Holborn.

Farnell, George Smith, Manchester, Tea Dealer. Pet Jan 21. Manchester, Feb 5. Sol Richardson, Manchester.

Fletcher, Samuel Grenville, Ashburnham Grove, Blackheath. Jan 19. London, Feb 7.

Ford, Branthwaite Bevor, 16 Daniel-st, Portsea, Surgeon. Pet Jan 18. Portsmouth, Feb 10. Sol Way, Portsea.

Gale, Thomas Beestock, 17 Spring-st, Kingston-upon-Hull, Ale and Porter Merchant. Pet Jan 22. Leeds, Feb 5. Sol Ayre, Hull.

George, Henry, 20 Swan-street, Newington, Surrey, Builder. Pet Jan 21. London, Feb 11. Sol Silvester, 18 Great Dover-st.

Golding, William Thomas, 6 East-parade, Hastings, Photographic Artist. Pet Jan 23. Hastings, Feb 7. Sol Meadows, Hastings.

Godsen, Henry, 3 George-st, Harper-st, New Kent-road, Surrey, Horse Jobber. Pet Jan 20. London, Feb 11. Sol Silvester, 18 Great Dover-st, Newington.

Graham, John Hind, 69 and 70 West-st, Kingston-upon-Hull. Pet Jan 20. Kingston-upon-Hull, Jan 21. Sol Sead, Hull.

Grierson, Matthew, 2 Paradise-sq, Oxford, Draper. Pet Jan 16. Oxford, Feb 10. Sol Williams, Oxford.

Griffiths, John, 5 Bedford-pl, Commercial-rd, East, Draper's Assistant. Pet Jan 22. London, Feb 12. Sols Lawrence, Smith, & Fawcett, 12 Broad-st, Chelsea.

Guthrie, Elizabeth, 10 Park-pl, Regent's-pk, Middlesex, Lodging-house Keeper. Pet Jan 20. London, Feb 11.

Haigh, Elizabeth, 36 Great St. Andrew-st, Bloomsbury, Middlesex. Jan 20. London, Feb 6.

Halse, Thomas, West Worlington, Devonshire, Farmer. Pet Jan 19. South Molton, Feb 11. Sol Orton, Barnstaple.

Harris, Evan, 19 Ivor-st, Dowlish, Merthyr-Tydfil, Coal Inspector. Pet Jan 20. Merthyr-Tydfil, Feb 4. Sol Forwood, Merthyr-Tydfil.

Harvey, John, 4 Wilton-ter, New North-rd, Islington, Middlesex, Agent for buying Horses. Pet Jan 20. London, Feb 11. Sols Wild & Barber, 104, Ironmonger-lane.

Hawkes, John, Burford, Oxfordshire, Horse Dealer. Pet Jan 20. Witney, Feb 6. Sol Ansell, Burford.

Hayburn, George, East Marton, Yorkshire, Cattle Dealer. Jan 18. Leeds, Feb 6. Sols Robinson, Settle, and Cariss & Tempest, Leeds.

Haywood, Philip, Windsor. Pet Jan 18. London, Feb 4.

Henshaw, Charles, 26 Philipot-lane, London, Wine Merchant. Pet Jan 22. London, Feb 4. Sol Harrow, 96 Guildford-st, Rus-sil-sq.

Hensord, John, jun, Keresley, near Coventry, Blacksmith. Pet Jan 20. Coventry, Feb 19. Sol Griffin, Leamington.

Hill, Edwin, 63 Aldermanbury, London, Commission Agent. Pet Jan 17. London, Feb 4. Sol Neal, Pinnars-hall.

Hippley, Augustus John, 4 Anderson-st, King's-rd, Chelsea, Middlesex. Jan 20. London, Feb 4.

Hobson, John Francis, Spark Brook, King's Norton, Warwickshire, Clerk. Pet Jan 18 (in forma pauperis). Stafford, Feb 5. Sol Litchfield, Newcastle-under-Lyne.

Holliday, Joseph, Liverpool, Draper. Pet Jan 14. Liverpool, Feb 3. Sols Evans, Son, & Sandys, Liverpool.

Holmes, Edward Henry, Tottenham, Middlesex, Commission Agent. Pet Jan 18. London, Feb 4. Sol King, 23 College-hill.

Hones, William Thomas, 21 New Broad-st, London, Leather Merchant. Pet Jan 17 (in forma pauperis). London, Feb 4. Sols Fenton & Sons, Berwick-st, Basinghall-sq.

Holt, John, Little Lever, Lancashire, Engraver. Pet Jan 21. Manchester, Feb 7. Sols Richardson & Hinnell, Bolton.

Holt, Peter Stephen, 3 Old Gravel-lane, Ratcliffe, Middlesex, Beer-shop Keeper. Jan 20. London, Feb 7. Sol Munday, Fountain-st, Strand.

Hutchings, Thomas, Axminster, Fancy Stationer. Pet Jan 21. Exeter, Feb 5. Sol Flood, Exeter.

Hutson, Joseph, Purton, Somersetshire, Farmer. Pet Jan 20. Bridgewater, Feb 12. Sol Carlisle, Bridgewater.

Jackson, William Henry, Weymouth-pl, New Kent-rd, Surrey, Riding Master. Pet Jan 18. London, Feb 4. Sol Hill, 10 Basinghall-sq.

Jones, John Stanley, Black Diamond-st, Cheshire, Baker, Pet Jan 20. Chester, Feb 21. Sol Massey, Chester.

Juson, John, jun., 25 Dudley-gr, Harrow-rd, Paddington, Middlesex, Omnibus Driver. Pet Jan 20 (in forma pauperis). London Feb 7. Leaning, Edwin, Ashby, Bottesford, Lincolnshire, Common Carrier. Pet Jan 20. Brigg, Feb 24. Sol Hayes, Gainsborough.

Lees, Joseph, Wellhouse, Goiccar, Yorkshire, Cloth Manufacturer. Jan 14. Leeds, Feb 6.

Leigh, Charles, Millgate, Stockport, Cheese Factor. Pet Jan 17. Stockport, Feb 14. Sol Howard, Stockport.

Lethbridge, Albert, Totnes, Innkeeper. Jan 17. Exeter, Feb 5. Sol Flood, Exeter.

Lomax, Richard, 1 Acre-pl, Cobourg-rd, Old Kent-rd, Surrey. Pet Jan 16. London, Feb 5. Sol Waldron, Great James-st, Bedford-row.

Longbottom, Abram, 3 Hammersmith-gate, Hammersmith, Middlesex, Engineer. Pet Jan 20. London, Feb 6. Sol Kent, 10 Mitre-st-chambers, Temple, London.

Maibair, Robert, 1 Elthwell-st, Cheetham, Manchester, Cabinet Designer. Pet Jan 21. Altrincham, Feb 10. Sol Horner, Manchester.

May, Joseph, 15 Wellington-st, Strand, Middlesex, Seedsman. Pet Jan 21. London, Feb 12. Sol Murray, 20 Great St. Helens.

McCleverty, John, Lees, Ashton-under-Lyne, Painter. Pet Jan 16. Ashton-under-Lyne, Feb 6. Sols Brooks, Marshall, and Brooks, Ashton-under-Lyne.

Miller, Edward, George-yard, Aldgate, Middlesex, Farrier. Pet Jan 21. London, Feb 4. Sol Webb, 159 Euston-road.

Middle, William, Henry, 22 High-st, Woolwich, Grocer. Pet Jan 20. London, Feb 12. Sol Hughes, 108 High-st-east, Woolwich.

Morrall, William, Crown-street, Bilston, Retailer of Ale. Pet. Wolverhampton, Feb 10. Sol Cresswell, Wellenhall.

Morris, William Edgar, Wellington-road, Dudley, Railway Clerk, Dec 27. Worcester, Jan 30. Sol Cordes Worcester.

Morton, Henry, Trinity-square, Southwark. Jan 18. London Feb 12.

Munday, John, Cranfield, Bedford. Butcher. Pet Jan 20. Amptill, Feb 5. Sol Stimson, jun, Bedford.

Murphy, William, 27 Great Marlborough-st, Regent-st, Comb Manufacturer. Pet Jan 21. London, Feb 10. Sol Munday, 6 Essex-st, Strand.

Murray, Thomas, 47 Commercial-rd, Lambeth, Ironmonger. Jan 18. London, Feb 5.
 Nichols, Thomas, Boston Spa, Yorkshire, Bookseller. Jan 14. Leeds, Feb 5.
 North, Arthur John, Easton Castle Public-house, 43 Union-st, Somers town, Middlesex, Licensed Victualler. Pet Jan 22. London, Feb 12.
 Sois Martineau & Reid, 3 Raymond's-buildings, Gray's-inn.
 Parkin, Francis, 6 Alma-street, Sheffield, Scissor Grinder. Pet Jan 22. Sheffield, Feb 7. Sol Broadbent, Sheffield.
 Penniket, George, Castle-rd, Southsea, Hants, Builder. Pet Jan 22. London, Feb 12. Sol Watson and Son, Bourne-st.
 Pepper, William, Bird in Hand Beer-shop, Amstall-rd, Bedford, Beer-shop Keeper. Pet Jan 22. Bedford, Feb 5. Sol Jessop, Bedford.
 Peters, John, 9 Somerset-pl, Swansea, Ship Broker. Pet Jan 14. Swansea, Feb 5. Sol Morris, Swansea.
 Pitt, William, Dudley-st, Kidderminster, Butcher. Pet Jan 20. Kidderminster, Feb 12. Sol Best, Kidderminster.
 Porter, Thomas, 7 Seymour-pl, Northampton. Pet Jan 20. London, Feb 14. Sol Shield & White, Northampton.
 Portmore, Charles Broadhurst, Derby. Pet Jan 11. Birmingham, Feb 6.
 Pope, Frederic, Kingston-upon-Hull, Coal Merchant. Pet Jan 23. Leeds, Feb 5. Sol G. & G. T. Allison, Darlington, and Caris & Tempest, Leeds.
 Quant, John, 7 Amersham-ale, New-cross, Deptford, Kent, Naval Architectural Druggist. Pet Jan 22. London, Feb 13. Sol Sadgrove & Son, 64 Mark-lane.
 Reeves, William, 1 Manor-villas, Manor-rd, Hackney, Shipping Broker's Clerk. Pet Jan 20. London, Feb 4. Sol Dalton, 3 Bucklersbury.
 Richardson, Warton, 10 Grafton-st, Tottenham Court-rd, Middlesex, Veterinary Surgeon. Pet Jan 21. London, Feb 7. Sol Nixon, 38 Lincoln's-inn-fields.
 Rowley, John, 8 Grosvenor-ter, Camberwell, Chemical Manufacturer. Pet Jan 22 (in forma pauperis). London, Feb 4. Sol Hicks, 7 Old Jewry.
 Ruff, Josiah, & Isaac Ward, Hampton, Middlesex, Tallow Molders. Pet Jan 18. London, Feb 11. Sol Mackrell, 34 Cannon-st. West.
 Sadden, Edward, 44 Dale-st, Accrington, Lancashire, Currier and Leather Dealer. Pet Jan 14. Manchester, Feb 6.
 Settle, James, 2 and 4 Flax-st, Adelphi, Salford, Provision Dealer. Pet Jan 21. Salford, Feb 3. Sol Swasey, Manchester.
 Shaw, Ann, Glosier, Derbyshire, Widow, Greaser. Pet Jan 21. Manchester, Feb 3. Sol Rodolph, Manchester.
 Shaw, William, Hoxington-lane, York, Cattle Dealer. Pet Jan 22. Leeds, Feb 10. Sol Mason, York.
 Shooter, George Edwin, 103 Saint Sidwell, Exeter, Upholsterer. Pet Jan 20. Exeter, Feb 4. Sol Floud, Exeter.
 Short, Joseph, Billingham, Lincolnshire, Tailor and Woollen Draper. Pet Jan 21. Nottingham, Feb 6. Sol Law, Stamford.
 Sisson, Thomas, jun., Leicester, Timber Merchant. Pet Jan 22. Nottingham, Feb 6. Sol Pike, Leicester, and Perry, Birmingham.
 Sitlington, George James, 16 Aldgate High-st, London, Contractor. Pet Jan 20. London, Feb 4. Sol Lewis, 23 Great Marlborough-st.
 Smallwood, John, Gunbarrel Filer, King's-bldgs, Mary-st, Ballal-leath, Worcester, Die Sinker. Pet Jan 20. Birmingham, Feb 14. Sol Sargent, Birmingham.
 Smith, John, Greetland, near Halifax, Manufacturer. Pet Jan 22. Leeds, Feb 6. Sol Bond & Barwick, Leeds.
 Smith, Walter, 24 Church-st, Soho, Middlesex, Bricklayer. Pet Jan 23 (in forma pauperis). London, Feb 11. Sol Scott, 36 Southampton-buildings.
 Stanton, Samuel, Northampton, Book-keeper. Pet Jan 21. Northampton, Feb 7. Sol Shield & White, Northampton.
 Still, Richard, Southwick-green, near Shoreham, Sussex, Baker. Pet Jan 21. London, Feb 11. Sol Harrison & Lewis, 6 Old Jewry.
 Tilmouth, Edward Marshall, 2 Western-ter, Lowestoft, Selimaker. Pet Jan 20. Lowestoft, Feb 3. Sol Seago, Lowestoft.
 Trickey, John, 26 New Bridge-st, Exeter, Boot & Shoe Maker. Pet Jan 21. Exeter, Feb 4. Sol Floud, Exeter.
 Urry, William, 10, 11, & 12, of Wigmore, Greaser. Pet Jan 15. London, Feb 12. Sol Walker & Serwood, 12 Furnal's-inn, and Buckel, Newport, Isle of Wight.
 Voulcs, Charles Henry, jun., 23 Westbourne-park-ter, Paddington, Middlesex, and 16 Gresham-st, London, Attorney-at-Law. Pet Jan 20. London, Feb 12. Sol Lawrence, Fivis, & Boyer, 14 Old Jewry-chambers.
 Waddelow, Thomas, Wisbech St. Peter's, Isle of Ely, Wheelwright. Pet Jan 12. Wisbech, Feb 6. Sol Girard, Wisbech.
 Walton, Samuel, Totmorden, Rochdale, Printer. Pet Jan 7. Manchester, Feb 5. Sol Sale, Worthington, Shipman, & Seddon, Manchester, and Ashurst, 6 Old Jewry, London.
 Webb, Richard Charles, Prospect Cottage, Victoria-rd, Reading. Pet Jan 20. London, Feb 7. Sol Bennett, 181 Tooley-street.
 Webb, Thomas, 2 The Grove, Stratford, Essex, Carver and Glider. Pet Jan 20. London, Feb 11. Sol Nicholls and Clark, 9 Cook's-court, Lincoln's-inn.
 Webb, William James, Hillington, Middlesex, Carpenter. Pet Jan 20. London, Feb 5. Sol St Aubyn, 30 Moorgate-st.
 Wells, John Thomas, Wyndham Cottage, Forest-hill, Surrey, Builder. Pet Jan 20. London, Feb 4.
 Wildmore, Christopher Dickenson, Billingshay, Lincolnshire, Watch and Clock Maker. Pet Jan 16. Slouford, Feb 11. Sol Brown and Son, Lincoln.
 Wilkins, George, 41 High-st, Portland-town, Middlesex, Plumber. Pet Jan 23 (in forma pauperis). London, Feb 4.
 Wile, Mark, 15 Francis-st, Strangeways, Lancashire, Attorney's Clerk. Salford, Feb 2.
 Williams, Edward, Willenhall, Staffordshire, Journeyman Caster. Pet Jan 18 (in forma pauperis). Stafford, Feb 5. Sol Litchfield, Newcastle-under-Lyme.
 Williams, Harry Robert, 90 Lower Thames-st, London, Oil Refiner. Pet Jan 20 (in forma pauperis). London, Feb 7.
 Winter, James, 14 Ballal-st, Birmingham, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet Jan 22. Birmingham, Feb 14. Sol Brown, Birmingham.
 Young, Henry, 43 St. Nicholas-ay, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Retailer of Beer. Pet Jan 20. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Feb 7. Sol Hoyle, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
 Young, James George, Woodbridge-rd, Guildford, Surrey, Baker. Pet Jan 22. London, Feb 12. Sol Murres, 3 Great James-st, Bedford-row.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY, AT THE LAW INSTITUTION, CHANCERY LANE.

ESTABLISHED MAY, 1856.

GENTLEMEN ARE REQUESTED TO SUBMIT QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION.

For Tuesday, February 4th, 1862. President—Mr. HINES.

Mr. FLASKITT will move—

"That no discussion take place with reference to the application of the surplus funds of the Society until the receipt of the Treasurer's Annual Report, and until the existence of a surplus has been ascertained."

286.—A residuary legatee attests a codicil revoking a legacy to another person—will he be entitled to the increased residue?
(Curry v. Curry, 3 Dea. 208.)

Affirmative—Mr. MELVILLE GREEN and Mr. REYNOLDS.

Negative—Mr. CHAMBERLAIN and Mr. WILLIAMS.

For Tuesday, February 11th, 1862. President—Mr. DOWSE.

287.—Should the Superior Courts have jurisdiction to grant a writ trial in criminal cases?

Mr. G. CHAMBERLAIN is appointed to open the debate, and Messieurs TRENKLE, LANE, and STONE to speak on the question.

For Tuesday, February 18th, 1862. President—Mr. WINGATE.

287.—Can an alienage of a covenantor on a covenant running with the land, maintain an action against the covenantor on such covenant in respect of a part only of the estate?
(See Barton on Abstractions, 87; Eng. V. & V., 486; Spencer's Case; Smith's Leading Cases.)

Affirmative—Mr. BRANFORD and Mr. WHEATLEY.

Negative—Mr. VIGAND and Mr. CHARLES SEWARD.

For Tuesday, February 25th, 1862. President—Mr. HEWITT.

288.—The mate of a vessel writes a letter to A. falsely imputing misconduct to the captain; A. believing the statements to be true communicates them to the owner, who, in consequence, dismisses the captain. Is the communication privileged?
(Cothhead v. Richards, 10 Jur. 984.)

Affirmative—Mr. MATTHEWS and Mr. VILLIAMS.

Negative—Mr. SWAN and Mr. LANSLEY.

THE CHAIR WILL BE TAKEN AT SEVEN O'CLOCK.

Gentlemen requiring Books from the Library are requested to apply for them in the Arbitration Room five minutes before Seven o'clock on the Evenings of Debate.

Copies of the Rules and all requisite information will be furnished by the Secretary, with whom Gentlemen, desirous of becoming Members, are requested to communicate.

ENTRANCE FEE, 10s. ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, 5s.

GEORGE L. WINGATE, Secretary,
9, Copthall-court, E.C.

PELICAN LIFE INSURANCE OFFICE,

ESTABLISHED IN 1757.

No. 70, Lombard-street, E.C., and 87, Charing Cross, S.W.

DIRECTORS.

Octavius E. Coope, Esq.
 William Cotton, Esq. D.C.L., F.R.S.
 John Davis, Esq.
 Jas. A. Gordon, Esq. M.D., F.R.S.
 Edward Hawkins, jun., Esq.
 Kirkman D. Hodgson, Esq. M.P.
 Robert Tucker, Secretary and Actuary.
 Henry Lancelot Holland, Esq.
 William James Lancaster, Esq.
 John Lubbock, Esq. F.R.S.
 Benjamin Shaw, Esq.
 Matthew Whiting, Esq.
 M. Wyvill, jun., Esq. M.P.

EXAMPLES OF the amount of BONUS awarded at the recent division of profits to Policies of £1,000 each, effected for the whole term of life at the undermentioned ages:—

Age when Assured.	Duration of Policy.	Bonus in Cash.	Bonus in Reversion.
20	7 years	25 1 0	£ 65 0 0
	14 years	26 3 0	72 10 0
	21 years	44 8 0	82 0 0
40	7 years	49 13 6	£ 42 10 0
	14 years	61 2 0	90 10 0
	21 years	75 9 6	108 0 0
60	7 years	95 4 6	127 10 0
	14 years	117 2 6	144 10 0
	21 years	144 1 0	165 10 0

* For Prospectuses, Forms of Proposal, &c., apply at the Office as above, or to any of the Company's Agents.

EQUITABLE REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY, 10, Lancaster-place, Strand.

Persons desirous of disposing of Reversionary Property, Life Interests, and Life Policies of Assurance, may do so at this Office to any extent, and for the full value, without the delay, expense, and uncertainty of an Auction.

Forms of Proposal may be obtained at the Office as above, and of Mr. HUMPHREYS, the Actuary of the Society, Globe Insurance, Cornhill.

JOHN CLAYTON, Joint Secretaries.
 F. S. CLAYTON,

To Landowners, the Clergy, Solicitors, Estate Agents, Surveyors, &c.

THE LANDS IMPROVEMENT COMPANY is incorporated by special Act of Parliament for England, Wales, and Scotland. Under the Company's Acts, tenants for life, trustees, mortgagees in possession, incumbents of livings, bodies corporate, certain lessees and other landowners, are empowered to charge the inheritance with the cost of improvements, whether the money be borrowed from the Company or advanced by the landowner out of his own funds.

The Company advance money, unlimited in amount, for works of improvement, the loans and incidental expenses being liquidated by a rent-charge for a specified term of years.

No investigation of title is required, and the Company, being of a strictly commercial character, do not interfere with the plans and execution of the works, which are controlled only by the Enclosure Commissioners.

The improvements authorised comprise drainage, irrigation, warping, embanking, enclosing, clearing, reclaiming, planting, erecting, and improving farm-houses, and buildings for farm purposes, farm roads, fountains, steam-engines, water-wheels, tanks, pipes, &c.

Owners in fee may effect improvements on their estates without incurring the expense and personal responsibilities incident to mortgages, and with out regard to the amount of existing incumbrances. Proprietors may apply jointly for the execution of improvements mutually beneficial, such as a common outfall, roads through the district, water-power, &c.

For further information, and for forms of application, apply to the Hon. WILLIAM NAPIER, Managing Director, 2, Old Palace-yard, Westminster.

ALBERT MEDICAL and FAMILY ENDOWMENT LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

Principal Office 7, Waterloo-place, London.

Branch Offices—At Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, Agra, and Hong Kong, with agencies throughout the United Kingdom.

POSITION, INCOME, AND PROGRESS, OF THE COMPANY.

The accumulated assets exceed	£650,000
The subscribed capital	500,000
The annual income from life premiums exceeds	250,000
The policy claims and bonuses paid to claimants about	1,000,000

The new business is progressing at the rate of about £35,000 per annum.

The Company contracts the following description of business:—Life Assurance on Healthy and Diseased Lives, Annuities and Endowments of all kinds, India Risk Assurances, and Guarantee business; and confers upon Insurers great facilities and advantages, coupled with perfect security.

Special and peculiar features have been adopted, in order to render the Company's Policies additionally valuable as securities, and to offer to the insured means whereby their policies may be saved from forfeiture.

Prospectuses, forms of proposal for Assurance, and every information, may be obtained on application to any of the Society's Agents; or to the Secretary, at 7, Waterloo-place, London, S.W., to whom applications for agencies in places not efficiently represented may be addressed.

FRANK EASUM, Secretary.

KAMPULICON OR ELASTIC FLOOR CLOTH,

as made by GOUGH & BOYCE, the Original Patentees, and laid exclusively by them at the Houses of Parliament, and numerous other Public Offices. It is especially adapted for Churches, Mansions, Public Rooms, Shops, and Passages, being clean, warm, noiseless, dry, and economical.

GOUGH & BOYCE, 12, Bush-lane, Cannon-street, London. Forwarded to all parts of the Country.

TRELOAR'S CORK FLOOR CLOTH, or KAMPULICON, COCOA NUT MATTING, and DOOR MATS. Best quality and moderate price.

T. TRELOAR, Manufacturer, 42, Ludgate-hill, London.

KAMPULICON or PATENT INDIA-RUBBER

AND CORK FLOORCLOTH. Warm, noiseless, and impervious to damp, as supplied to the Houses of Parliament, British Museum, Windsor Castle, Buckingham Palace, and numerous public and private offices.

F. G. TRESTRAIL & Co., 19 & 20, Walbrook, London, E.C.

Manufactory—South London Works, Lambeth.

COAL.—The GUINEA COAL COMPANY'S

WALLEND'S all the year round, can only be obtained by addressing to the Secretary, Mr. JAMES JENNINGS, 7, York-road, King's-cross Station, N. Coke, &c.

ALBION SNELL, Watchmaker and Jeweller, has removed to his New Premises, 114, High Holborn, seven doors east of King-street, where he respectfully solicits an inspection of his new and well-selected stock.

A WONDERFUL LIGHT.—The most brilliant and economical artificial light known is obtained from the STELLA LAMP. No smoke! No smoke! No danger! During 12 consecutive hours the cost from one penny. The secret of success arises from perfect combustion. If you do not use gas, by all means put away candles, and adopt the STELLA LAMP. Price 1s. 3d. to 3 guineas; office lamps from 2s. 6d.

Depot, No 11, Oxford-street, adjoining the Star Brewery.

CHEDDAR LOAF CHEESE, 6½d., 7½d., and 8½d. per lb.

Ripe Stilton, 7d. to 1s. per lb.
Small Dantzic Tongues, 2s. 6d. per half dozen.
Prime Ox ditto, 2s. 3d. each, or three for 6s. 6d.

Osborne's Peat-smoked Breakfast Bacon is now in excellent cure, and Butters in perfection, at reasonable rates; other first-class Provisions equally moderate; packages gratis.

OSBORNE'S CHEESE WAREHOUSE,

Osborne House, 30, Ludgate-hill, near St. Paul's, E.C.

GLENFIELD PATENT STARCH, USED IN THE ROYAL LAUNDRY.

THE LADIES are respectfully informed that this STARCH is EXCLUSIVELY USED IN THE ROYAL LAUNDRY.

And HER MAJESTY'S LAUNDRESS says, that although she has tried WHEATEN, RICE, and OTHER POWDER STARCHES, she has found none of them equal to the GLENFIELD, which is THE FINEST STARCH SHE EVER USED.

WHEN YOU ASK FOR

GLENFIELD PATENT STARCH,

See that you get it, as inferior kinds are often substituted.

WOTHERSPOON & Co., GLASGOW AND LONDON.

JOHN GOSNELL & CO., PERFUMERS TO THE QUEEN, beg to recommend the following Fashionable and Superior Articles for the TOILET to the especial notice of all purchasers of Choice PERFUMERY.

John Gosnell & Co.'s JOCKEY CLUB PERFUME, in universal request as the most admired perfume for the handkerchief, price 2s. 6d.

John Gosnell & Co.'s LA NOBLESSE PERFUME—a most delicate perfume of exquisite fragrance.

John Gosnell & Co.'s GARIBALDI BOUQUET—a most choice and fashionable perfume.

John Gosnell & Co.'s RUSSIAN LEATHER PERFUME—a very fashionable and agreeable perfume.

John Gosnell & Co.'s BALL-ROOM COMPANION or FOUNTAIN PERFUMES. Elegant Novelties, in the form of Portable Handkerchief Perfumes in a neat case, which emits on pressure a jet of most refreshing perfume. Price 1s. and 1s. 6d. each.

John Gosnell & Co.'s LA NOBLESSE POMADE—elegantly perfumed, and highly recommended for beautifying and promoting the growth of Hair.

John Gosnell & Co.'s GOLDEN OIL—Molline—Maassar Oil—Bears' rease, &c., for the Hair.

John Gosnell & Co.'s CHERRY TOOTH PASTE is greatly superior to any Tooth Powder, gives the Teeth a pearl-like whiteness, protects the enamel from decay, and imparts a pleasing fragrance to the breath.

John Gosnell & Co.'s AMBROSIAL SHAVING CREAM, 1s. and 1s. 6d. in pots; also, in compressible tubes, for the convenience of persons travelling, price 1s.

John Gosnell and Co.'s INSTANTANEOUS HAIR DYE—The only Hair Dye which produces a good natural colour with perfect certainty, and with the least possible trouble.

Manufactory, 12, Three King-court, Lombard-street, London.

THE GUINEA HAMPER, consisting of one Bottle

Port, one ditto Sherry, one ditto Brandy, one ditto Rum, one ditto Gin, one ditto Whiskey. Hamper and Bottles included.—To be had of CHARLES A. SIMPSON, 4, Sermon-lane, Doctors'-commons, London, E.C. Post-office Orders to be made payable at the General Post Office. Bottled Ales and Stout in the finest perfection. Price list of Wines, &c., sent free per post on application.

RHEUMATISM, Rheumatic Gout, and Rheumatic

Fever, CURED by GARDNER'S RHEUMATIC COMPOUND, which may be taken with perfect safety, containing no colchicum or any other ingredient detrimental to health. This medicine is dispensed gratuitously to the poor by the London Bible Mission. Sold by the most respectable Druggists.—Wholesale and retail depot, No. 70, Mark-lane, E.C. Price 1s. 1½d., and 2s. 1½d. per bottle.

HOLLOWAY'S OINTMENT AND PILLS.

Dropsical Swellings.—Whatever may be the remote cause of collections of water in the human body, it must be prudent to disperse them as soon as possible. The readiest means of accomplishing this end are supplied by using Holloway's Ointment to increase the activity of the absorbent. When this Ointment is well rubbed upon the skin, it removes all venous congestion, overcomes all mechanical obstruction to the free return of the blood, and prevents the deposit of serum or water. Holloway's Pills likewise augment this absorbing power; they act more circuitously on the capillaries through the circulation, while his Ointment acts directly through the skin. Both should be employed in dropsies and diseases of the kidneys.

CONSUMPTION and other diseases characterized by

a rapid circulation of the blood cannot be cured or even alleviated until the pulse is reduced. This can only be accomplished by the use of OZONIZED COD LIVER OIL, as proved at the Hospital for Consumption, Brompton, London. See Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society's Transactions, Vol. 42, for 1859; Lancet, July 9, 1859; Pharmaceutical Journal, August 1, 1859, &c.

Prepared only by G. BOWWICK, Sole Licensor, 21, Little Moorfields, London. Sold in 2s. 6d., 4s. 9d., and 9s. Bottles, by all Druggists.

L.
A
S
-
it
-
I
or
to
-
r
-
d
n-
E-
r-
g
d.
of
rs'
to
be
d.
-
ly
7.
le
te
of
C.
ed
re
ic
D.
y
re-
C.
-
cl-
re
are
sh-
in
y's
ly
of
-
y
ed
of
m,
se-
el,
is,